

TO THE READER

KINDLY use this book very carefully. If the book is disfigured or marked or written on while in your possession the book will have to be replaced by a new copy or paid for. In case the book be a volume of set of which single volumes are not available the price of the whole set will be realized.

Checked

1976

9/9/85

AMARSINGH COLLEGE



Library.

Class No. 325-342

Book No. S 93 p

Acc. No. 806 ✓

THE PROBLEM OF
EMPIRE GOVERNANCE

100
A/1

THE PROBLEM OF EMPIRE GOVERNANCE

BY
CHARLES E. T. STUART-LINTON

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.
39 PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON
NEW YORK, BOMBAY, AND CALCUTTA
1912

325-342

943 P

Acc. no. 806

‘ May He Who hath built up this Britannic
Empire to a glorious and enviable height, with
all her daughter lands about her, stay us in
this felicity ! ’—*Milton*.

PREFACE.

It is with no little diffidence that the author ventures to present this treatise dealing with the political unity and future of the British Empire. The question, in its modern aspect, though over a quarter of a century old, still seems a great distance from the arena of practical politics. It is possible that critics of the book may characterise some of the author's suggestions as purely academic, and therefore of no practical value, claiming, as they no doubt will, that the time is not sufficiently ripe for the discussion of some of these questions. But if we are to ignore them solely on that ground they will not only for ever remain so, but the Empire as a political entity will have vanished from the ranks of the great world-Powers. It is only by the free and frequent discussion of these Imperial questions that they can ever enter the realm of practical politics. To do otherwise will be to for ever doom a great and practical idea to academic speculation only—to a grave of mere theory. It is the purpose of this book, therefore, to discuss and consider the various details which, taken collectively, involve the Federation of the Empire. If it will induce reflection, it may also, in time, lead to

intelligent action. If it does this, the author will feel well rewarded for his task. There is no doubt that modifications of these views may be necessary. He expects that ; but " The Problem of Empire Governance " will have accomplished some good in giving something to discuss that will lead to the quickest and best way of attaining the purpose in view. With that object the author submits the following chapters, intended to cover every phase of the subject presented to him.

The author desires to thank the editors of *The British Empire Review*, *The Empire Review*, and the *United Service Magazine* for their kind permission to include in this book portions of several articles which appeared in their respective publications.

CHARLES E. T. STUART-LINTON.

June 1912.

CONTENTS.

PART I.

CHAP.	PAGE
PREFACE	vii
I.—DISINTEGRATION OR FEDERATION	i
II.—THE ORIGIN AND GROWTH OF IMPERIAL UNITY	15
III.—AN IMPERIAL COUNCIL	25
IV.—THE SOVEREIGN AND HIS TITLE	30

PART II.

I.—THE PARLIAMENT OF THE BRITISH EMPIRE—THE HOUSE OF COMMONS	36
II.—THE PARLIAMENT OF THE BRITISH EMPIRE—THE SENATE	51
III.—THE IMPERIAL PRIVY COUNCIL AND CABINET	67
IV.—THE STATUS OF THE UNITED KINGDOM UNDER FEDERA- TION	70
V.—AN IMPERIAL SUPREME COURT	73
VI.—DRAFT BILL FOR A CONFEDERATION OF THE EMPIRE	78
VII.—DRAFT OF A WRITTEN CONSTITUTION FOR THE EMPIRE	82

PART III.

I.—IMPERIAL DEFENCE—THE COMMAND OF THE SEA	99
II.—IMPERIAL DEFENCE—THE DOMINIONS AND NAVAL DE- FENCE	104
III.—IMPERIAL DEFENCE—FOREIGN NATIONS AND SEA POWER	118
IV.—IMPERIAL DEFENCE—THE NECESSITY FOR AN IMPERIAL NAVY	125
V.—IMPERIAL DEFENCE—THE MILITARY FORCES	133
VI.—THE DEFENCE OF FRANCE—THE PROBLEM OF IMPERIAL DEFENCE	138
VII.—IMPERIAL DEFENCE—AN IMPERIAL ARMY	143

PART IV.

CHAP.	PAGE
I.—IMPERIAL FINANCE AND TAXATION	154
II.—THE FISCAL POLICY OF THE EMPIRE	167
III.—THE FISCAL POLICY OF THE EMPIRE (continued)	179
IV.—IMPERIAL STATE AID TO EMIGRATION	189
V.—PRACTICAL IMPERIALISM	202
VI.—THE DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR SERVICES AND OTHER IMPERIAL MATTERS	215
VII.—CONCLUSION	218
INDEX	235

THE PROBLEM OF EMPIRE GOVERNANCE

PART I.

CHAPTER I.

DISINTEGRATION OR FEDERATION.

THE British Empire, as at present constituted, is the expansion of England from the nucleus formed in the reign of Elizabeth. It was during the Elizabethan period that the greatest deeds on the high seas were accomplished by those great sea captains Drake, Hawkins, Frobisher, Gilbert, Raleigh, and Grenville, who sailed the Spanish Main and carried the honour of England to the furthest parts of the New World. It was directly owing to the exploits of these great spirits that the expansion of England took place under the succeeding sovereigns. It is an interesting fact that the British Empire owes its nativity to the reign of Queen Elizabeth and its enormous expansion and great progress to the reign of Queen Victoria. The Elizabethan and Victorian ages are, therefore, bound up with the most glorious annals of the Empire.

As constituted to-day this Empire consists of vast stretches of territory scattered over the globe and separated by the "Seven Seas," exhibiting a medley of political conditions owing a common allegiance to the British throne. Within its confines are the most democratic of democracies and the most despotic of despotisms—the Dominion of New Zealand and the Nizam's dominions. It is an Empire, to use the words of the great American Daniel Webster, "whose morn-

ing drum-beat, following the sun and keeping company with the hours, encircles the globe with an unbroken chain of martial airs."

On the accession of Queen Victoria in 1837 the population of the British Empire was 31,712,000, and the area 7,255,350 square miles. In 1912 the population had increased to 419,401,371, and the area to 11,447,954 square miles.

The British Empire in 1912.

Area (square miles)	11,447,954
Population	419,401,371
Revenue	£402,002,545
Expenditure	£356,005,587
Debt	£1,602,937,194
Exports	£1,078,237,577
Imports	£1,183,052,085
Registered tonnage—					
Sailing	1,992,808
Steam	11,372,004
Tonnage entered and cleared	319,777,509
Railways (miles)	115,285

From the above statistics one can readily realise the wealth and resources of the British Empire. And these resources, so far from being greatly developed, are yet for the most part in their infancy. From this it should not be difficult to appreciate the axiom that the whole is greater than its parts. Taken collectively, this wealth and these resources are enormous and unparalleled in the history of any other nation; but taken separately there is nothing so very wonderful and enormous about them.

If, then, under conditions of inferior and defective organisation, the material forces of the Empire are so great, what would they not be under a system whereby these forces were carefully fostered and properly utilised? A system which would counteract the centrifugal tendencies of its present composition, supplemented by methods whereby the theory that the whole is greater than the parts would receive unchallenged recognition, and the various units would accordingly work for the common weal—a system by which the

strength and defensive forces for the protection of the whole would be properly developed and utilised. For the integrity of the whole means the integrity of the parts, and the downfall and destruction of the whole likewise means the destruction of the parts.

The last decade has witnessed a rapid growth of sentiment in favour of Imperial unity, and the subject has received considerable attention from public men and the Press, both at home and in the Colonies. Yet, notwithstanding the spread of an Imperial sentiment or patriotism, a great deal of ignorance is still exhibited by the stay-at-home Britisher on Imperial and Colonial affairs, and the average want of knowledge regarding the geographical, political, and economical subjects is still very high. There was even a time when a strong party was in favour of cutting the Colonies adrift, maintaining that it would make no difference to our trade and commerce if such a policy were adopted. Happily for the Empire such ideas are practically buried, and it is to be hoped that they will never be resurrected.

Possibly the most striking examples showing a growth of the Imperial idea are: the sending of contingents from the great Colonies to participate with the Imperial troops in the campaigns in Egypt, Zululand, South Africa, and China, the establishment of an Imperial penny postage, the construction of a pan-Britannic cable connecting the King's dominions, and the forward and Imperial policy of Canada, South Africa, New Zealand, and Australia in giving a preference to British products in their markets over the foreigner. Imperial defence has come to be regarded as a vital question affecting the Empire as a whole, and in this connection the importance of the creation of the Committee of Imperial Defence cannot be minimised. Recently two Conferences have been witnessed, both of which cannot help having a great influence upon the Empire—the Imperial Press Conference and the Imperial Defence Conference. These events of the last twenty years are undoubtedly most important in their beneficent effect upon the British Empire.

But in regard to the political relations of the Empire, as a whole, we have made little headway in the direction of Imperial unity. We have, it is true, commonly agreed upon holding quaterennial Imperial Conferences, the importance of which certainly cannot be overestimated. An excellent precedent, moreover, has been established by making a Colonial statesman a member of the Permanent Council on Imperial Defence, but our advance to closer unity in our political system has gone no further. The Empire in everything else has rapidly grown and expanded.

With the possible exception of India, the British Empire to-day consists of the Mother Country and a group of loosely connected States in various stages of political development. It has been likened by some to a loose league of scattered republics. This, in a sense, may be true, yet, as we are informed, "the bonds, though light as air, are firm as steel." If this be so, say the opponents of closer unity, then why not let well alone? Why interfere with this imposing structure? Adopt the policy of *laissez faire*. Why risk our present contentment and seek to draw nearer to one another, at the risk of imposing upon all bonds of iron that may chafe? But we may ask these opponents to consider the future and not alone the present. It is characteristic of our race to dwell too much on the present and let to-morrow take care of itself. As Cecil Rhodes once said, "the curse of English statesmen is that they will not consider the future." But Mr. Chamberlain, at any rate, has looked into the future, and has said: "Does anyone really believe that our present relations with our possessions abroad can permanently endure? Is it not certain that we and they must draw closer, or we shall inevitably fall apart? Is it possible my opponents are not alive to the tremendous consequences of either alternative? What is it? Are we to be an Empire, or are we to be only a Kingdom?"

To anyone who has given the question careful study it must appear that things cannot continue in their present course. If there is to be a British Empire of the

future our political system must be altered. As matters now stand they can lead sooner or later only to disintegration. No half-way is possible. Our whole system at present tends toward this end. As the Colonies grow under the present colonial system that growth can only result in ultimate separation, for obvious reasons. This system, which is beneficent to-day, will prove destructive to-morrow. The old colonial system was suited to the conditions of its day, whereby the Colonies and Dependencies were considered primarily to be held and used for the advantage of the Mother Country. They were considered in the sense of so many possessions. But it is contrary to British ideas and equity that a people akin to us in blood should be held in possession by their kin at home. As Mr. Chamberlain has said, "the sense of possession has now given place to the sentiment of kinship. We think and speak of them as part of ourselves, as part of the British Empire, united to us, although they may be dispersed throughout the world, by ties of kindred, religion, of history, and of language, and joined to us by the seas that formerly seemed to divide us."

This idea of possession lost us America, and by our delay in ignoring the necessity of granting local autonomy might have lost us Canada. But as a result of the Canadian Rebellion came the great Report of Lord Durham, the charter of local autonomy for the British Colonies—a second Magna Charta.

This was the beginning of a new era for the British Empire. It recognised the principle that the Colonies were no longer to be held exclusively for the benefit of the Mother Country, but were to be maintained for the benefit of themselves, and that the principle of self-government was to be applied wherever and whenever the British dominions became qualified for it. It was the recognition of these principles in our new colonial system that has undoubtedly saved the British Empire thus far from the fate of those other Empires—Spain, Portugal, and Holland.

But though these principles have proved wise and

essential, they lack one vital point—a point so vital that it will soon prove the present system to be as obsolete and unsuited to new conditions as was the old. It is true that we grant various powers of local autonomy to the Colonies, according to the stages of their development—from the Crown Colony, with its nominated Council, to full-fledged self-government of the kind in force in Canada and Australia. But there the system halts and stands still : it goes no farther. Nothing is in operation beyond that which will result in giving these self-governing parts a share in the government of the whole. It is here that our system is still fatally defective. On the other hand, the system in vogue in the United States is, up to a certain point, in some respects similar. But the American system of self-government goes further ; its Constitution provides for the inclusion of territory thousands of miles away into the Union as States when those territories have long enjoyed self-government, no matter where they may be situated. The territories or dependencies of Hawaii, Porto Rico, the Samoan Islands, and the Philippines are represented in the Congress of the United States by delegates who take part in debate, though they at present are debarred from voting. These communities will gradually, when fitted for it, obtain degrees of local autonomy, and eventually be admitted into the Union as States and be represented in both Houses of Congress.

But the conditions in our system, so far from standing for ever still, will gradually tend to promote dismemberment. The sentiment and love for the Mother Country, which is now so great, will no doubt for a considerable period check such tendencies, even though the Dominions might have nothing to gain, and probably much to lose, from British connection. “ Sentiment,” however, says Mr. Chamberlain, “ without organisation is nothing better than courage without discipline.” So that in the end self-interest will triumph over sentiment, the tension will become too great, and dismemberment will follow.

Take for example either Australia or Canada fifty years hence, with their probably large population and great increase in wealth; will they then consent to remain in the same political status toward Great Britain as at present? Will they continue to rely for their defence on the people of the United Kingdom, even supposing for an instant that the taxpayer at home would acquiesce? No, they will control their own naval and military forces. It is also highly improbable that under such circumstances they would consent to England's absolute control of the foreign policy or to run the risk of being drawn without notice into England's wars—wars which, under such conditions, they might have little or no sympathy with, but wars that they would be powerless to prevent. Even to-day demands for treaty-making powers for the Dominions are heard. All this tends towards ultimate separation.

Under the present policy the Imperial Parliament is powerless to impose taxes upon the self-governing communities outside of the United Kingdom, and any attempt to do so would be likely to result in a condition of affairs similar to that which existed in our American Colonies immediately prior to 1776. The issue, "no taxation without representation," has long ago been fought out and buried, never again to be revived. But it may be asked, Will the British people at home for all time to come consent to foot practically the whole bill of Imperial defence and other Imperial obligations, when the oversea dominions will have arrived at such a stage in their development that they can well afford to take upon themselves an equal share of the responsibilities, and when in fifty years, or less time than that, the British beyond the seas will equal or surpass in number those at home? And, as already pointed out, will those dominions acquiesce in the continuance of such conditions? They will not then rely on the protection of the Mother Country solely, and they will very probably refuse to support a common defence for all, as the old issue of "no taxation without representation" would confront them. Already Canada and Australia

have begun the construction of local navies. All this will then lead to separation. For it is inconceivable to think that the Dominions would under such conditions of power and prosperity continue in their colonial status under the control of Britain in regard to foreign policy and other matters. They would then no longer have anything to gain from such a connection, and, as already pointed out, would, under such circumstances, likely have much to lose.

Lord Rosebery some years ago, when speaking on this subject, said: "When you declare war, on whatever ground it may be, in a fit of anger, under the idea of slighted honour, under any of those causes for which we have seen nations hurry rashly into war—whenever you declare war on any of those grounds you do not declare war alone, but Canada declares war, Australia declares war, every Dependency in the Empire declares war, and they declare war without having an official voice in the control of our policy. Remember this: you form a policy, and my critic says you demand that it shall be uncontrolled by your Colonies. But when your policy has begun to take effect your Colonies may be invaded, they may be harassed, they may be burned, they may be plundered—all in consequence of the course of action in which they have had no controlling voice. Now, that is not a dream, that is not an idea. It is an uncommonly concrete fact, both for our critics and for the Colonies.

"Now, gentlemen, it is rather remarkable that Mr. Bright, who is our most venerated opponent, once alluded to that argument this year and took it as the text of a speech against our view. Mr. Bright said, speaking of Imperial Federation, 'Will the Colonies be willing to undertake the responsibility of entering into wars, the seat of which is ten thousand miles away, in which they have not the slightest interest, when they might not have been consulted as to the cause of the quarrel which this country was rushing into?' But, gentlemen, that is precisely their position now; and that is precisely what we wish to avert by Imperial Federation. I say that

this state of things, for both sides, is anomalous and cannot continue. On the one hand you pay for everything, and that is a fool's bargain for you; and, on the other hand, the Colonies may be dragged into a war without a voice in the matter, and that is a fool's bargain for them. Now, I believe that when the numerous Parliaments which exist under the British Crown come to see this question in all its bearings, they will demand a substantial voice in the control of British policy of the future."

On another occasion Lord Rosebery concluded his speech with these words: "I have said that foreign policy in the future will be very largely concerned, and is very largely concerned, with questions of colonial policy, but that raises the question of whether you wish to have a colonial policy at all. There was at one time in this country a demand to be free from the responsibility of a Colonial Empire. Well, I think that demand has ceased, but the people of this country will, at a not too distant future, have to make up their minds what footing they wish their Colonies to occupy with respect to them, or whether they desire their Colonies to leave them altogether. It is, as I believe, absolutely impossible for you to maintain in the long run your present loose and indefinable relations to your Colonies and preserve these Colonies as parts of the Empire."

Contrast with these sentiments the following declaration lately made by Lord Rosebery: "Men are misled by the analogy of other empires, ancient and modern. They will not and cannot realise that the British Empire is, and must necessarily always be, unlike these. The true ideal is, and should be, a vast co-operative league of contented and emulous Anglo-Saxon States, together with an Empire in the East of different races and conditions. When that truth is grasped we shall have less of the perilous rhetoric as to the necessity either of mechanically drawing closer or drifting apart, less of the specious fallacy that if there be not a constant centripetal movement in the Empire there will be a constant centrifugal movement. You might as well say

share in Imperial wars as treaty obligations, and the advice of His Majesty's Ministers on the spot should decide."

This certainly cannot be rightly called Imperial Federation, involving a drawing together of all parts of the Empire to one another. Far from drawing closer this would mean drawing still farther away. It would not be Federation, but, at the most, a very loose and brittle Confederation, which would hardly survive a single shock. It would not be much better than the Holy Roman Empire in its last days or the Turkish Empire of to-day. Certainly there would be cause for alarm if this so-called British Empire relied for its integrity on a struggling nondescript collection of local armies and navies. The present great prestige of the Empire and its united service would then be far below par. Such a course, instead of conserving peace, would invite aggression.

The correct meaning of Imperial Federation, therefore, is not shown by these schemes. The true idea of Federation as applied to the peoples of this Empire is embraced in a Federal Parliament, with its Federal executive having jurisdiction over all matters that are Imperial. Nothing short of this would meet the requirements of the political genius of our people or be in accord with the Anglo-Saxon principles of our Government. If such a policy be impracticable, as has been asserted by many, then permanent Imperial Unity can never be, and this stately structure, the British Empire, must fall, even as it has risen.

But this, of course, cannot, any more than Rome, be built in a day. The whole fabric of a United Empire cannot alone be created by a single Act of Parliament. A steady growth, however, towards that end by the introduction of details—of Imperial mosaics, which, in the aggregate, would complete the structure—would in time so order things that the final formal establishment of an Imperial Constitution by Act of Parliament would come within the range of practical politics. It is thus that the Federation of the Empire will probably be

attained. Yet we must not shut our eyes to the fact that events and forces in the world might determine a policy for us of revolution rather than evolution in the reaching of our Imperial destiny.

The idea of Federal Government is, to a certain extent, new to the British people at home, who have become by long usage familiar only with the centralised form of government existent in the United Kingdom to-day. To our kin in the Dominions Federal Government is not a novelty, for the federal system is now working in three of our great groups of self-governing Colonies, or, as Sir John MacDonald once called them, "our auxiliary kingdoms." And the result is, in the main, successful. In fact, in large and extensive countries, like the United States and Canada, it is the only form of government possible. It is, in a way, a compromise between the highly centralised State and the extremely decentralised State. Its chief characteristic and advantage is the segregation of national and local interests, whereby in a large community or communities the whole process of government may be better undertaken. It also offers a more permanent system by diminishing the number of independent sovereignties, and secures peace amongst the units of which it is composed.

Two requisites are therefore essential in order to establish a Federal State in its proper form. In the first place the units, in regard to those questions which interest each separately, must be sovereign, and therefore absolutely independent. This principle exists in a greater or less degree in all existing federations, though not absolutely. For many of the more important details, which should theoretically be local, have by legislation been made federal, such as criminal jurisprudence, marriage, and divorce, which, in Canada, are under federal jurisdiction. The tendency is thus towards centralisation. But in all questions concerning the units collectively, such as defence, foreign policy, and treaties, the autonomy of the units separately vanishes. Each unit is sovereign in its sphere, but in the higher

sphere which concerns all the units collectively they present to the world one consolidated sovereignty.

The idea of federal government is by no means a modern institution, though its success as a system is comparatively so. We can find a glimmering of the idea among the ancients. Probably the earliest known of any approach towards the federal system is the Delphic Amphictyonic Council, established by the Greeks in B.C. 595, which was, however, a league of a religious rather than of a political or defensive character. Later came the Confederation of Delos and the Ætolian and Achæan Leagues, and also the Bœotian, probably the truest of Greek federations, though not so well known as the Achæan and others. Thence can be traced the idea through the Italian, Dutch, and German Leagues, through the Holy Roman Empire, the Swiss Confederation, and down to the creation of the United States of America under their Constitution in 1789, and subsequently to the Confederation of British North America in 1867. This was followed a few years later by the federation of the German States, under the guidance of the Iron Chancellor. In 1901 was formed the Australian Commonwealth, and the latest example is the Union of British South Africa in 1910.

Five great countries are now working out their political destinies under the federal system, and it is, therefore, to the United States, Canada, Australia, Germany, Switzerland, and South Africa that we look for knowledge in the framing of a federal constitution for the British Empire. Ours, then, would be in some respects a federation within a federation. We would then have, as Sir Frederick Young says, after Abraham Lincoln, "the Government of the Empire by the Empire, for the Empire." A finer cry, and of wider sentiment, than "Australia for the Australians," "Canada for the Canadians," will be "The Empire for its people." Our ideal, therefore, is to make the Empire a powerful *Bundesstaat*, developing our gradual federal constitution on British ideas, keeping always before us the principles of our present unwritten instrument, the British Constitution.

CHAPTER II.

THE ORIGIN AND GROWTH OF IMPERIAL
UNITY.

“ There is not the least probability that the British Constitution would be hurt by the union of Great Britain with the Colonies. That Constitution, on the contrary, would be completed by it, and it seems to be imperfect without it. . . . That this union, however, could be easily effectuated, or that difficulties—and great difficulties—might not occur in the execution, I do not pretend. I have yet heard of none, however, which appear insurmountable.”—Adam Smith's *Wealth of Nations*.

WHAT is known as Imperial Federation is of older origin than is often supposed. The idea became dormant, however, after the schism which rent the British race asunder, and it is only within the last quarter of a century that it has been revived, consequent upon the growth and potentiality of another Empire.

This vast and varied body politic is wonderful in many respects, but probably the most interesting phenomenon to be observed therein is the extraordinary cohesive force exerted by the United Kingdom in maintaining the integrity of the combined whole. Proud and glorious as this condition may be, it is fraught with grave dangers, owing to the centrifugal tendencies naturally existent in a system embracing so many different nationalities and of such diverse civil polity. It is from the deep conviction of these dangers that the revived doctrine of Imperial Federation has had its inception.

It was propagated by a select few towards the end of the last century, receiving some impetus by the establishment of the Imperial Federation and British Empire Leagues. These leagues were founded by those who conceived, and have since employed both brain and energy to the advocacy and establishment of that most noble of all political doctrines—the unity of the Empire.

As far back as William Penn, the founder of the Province of Pennsylvania in North America, can be traced its genesis. Even at that time Penn recommended representation for the American colonists in Parliament, and for the formation of a real Imperial Army, recruited and officered both at home and in the Colonies. While in the reign of George III., Adam Smith, in his "Wealth of Nations," recommends a form of Customs Union for the British dominions. Benjamin Franklin was also at one time an ardent Imperialist. Up to 1774, a year prior to the outbreak of the Revolutionary War, and two years before the Declaration of Independence, Franklin still urged for a truly "Imperial policy which would aim at the good of the British Empire," and not at "the advantage of one part in the disadvantage of the others." He was strongly opposed to the Mother Country seeking to profit at the expense of the Colonies and the Colonies seeking to profit at the expense of the Mother Country, for by so doing it "tended to create dissensions, and weaken that union on which the strength, solidity, and duration of empire greatly depended." It is known also that Burke shared these views, and had visions of a United Empire welded into a federal union, though the distance of his day seemed to make such a policy impracticable. The twentieth century has, however, removed the objection of distance with which in the eighteenth century Burke had to contend. The idea, nevertheless, never gained sufficient strength to become widely known, and thus it may be taken that the doctrine of Imperial Federation had its practical inception towards the close of the nineteenth century.

It resulted, in a measure, from the reaction which followed the policy of the Little Englander in his zealous endeavour to "shave the Empire"; the policy known as "Peace at any price," which had gratuitously handed over British territory and strategic positions to the nations as magnanimous concessions; the policy which permitted the occupation of New Caledonia by France, notwithstanding the pro-

testations of Australia; which recognised the Transvaal Republic after Majuba, and which would have permitted Africa to be carved up by the European Concert, but for the foresight and determination of Cecil Rhodes. By the expenditure of much private capital Cecil Rhodes secured vast regions of territory for the Empire, thus frustrating several of the Powers. This same policy did its best to snub the Colonies at every conceivable opportunity, and more than once gave them to understand that the sooner separation came the better for all concerned. In spite of this narrow-minded and foolish treatment by insular and parochial politicians, the Dominions, instead of drawing away from the Mother Country, have been drawing nearer. At the first call to arms, they flew to the assistance of their motherland, thus falsifying the opinion of Mr. (now Lord) Morley, when he said years ago: "As well might one believe that New Zealand would spend her blood and treasure to uphold British supremacy in South Africa." Clearly the simile of Turgot, who said "Colonies are like fruits which remain on the tree only until they are ripe," is exploded and held now only by the Little Englander. After nearly half a century of sordid commercial gain the British people at length awakened from their lethargy and refused to submit to further humiliation at the hands of the "Peace at any price" devotees.

It was then that the doctrine of Imperial consolidation became firmly established. The idea and sentiment had to a great extent been intensified in 1886 on the introduction of Mr. Gladstone's Irish Bill. This seemed to many the most critical period in the history of the British Empire. The Home Rule measure, which to some seemed only a matter of the internal administration of the United Kingdom, was held by many to involve the disintegration of the Empire. Even up to Queen Victoria's Golden Jubilee in 1887, some were still in favour of disintegration. But with the consummation of that great event the sentiments held by the Little Englander quickly waned, and in 1897, during

the celebrations of the Diamond Jubilee of Queen Victoria, all parties were in favour of Imperial Unity.

Within the last few years Imperial Consolidation has again come more prominently before the minds of Britishers, whether at home or in the Dominions, by the sentiment aroused in our kinsmen beyond the seas on the outbreak of the South African War, a sentiment which prompted the Colonies and India to send 111,000 troops to take the field beside their brothers in the Imperial Service. It was then that the world learned a stern and significant lesson, a lesson most unpalatable to foreign statesmen, viz. that war with the United Kingdom meant war with the British Empire, a war not against 45,000,000 of people inhabiting the British Isles, but against 400,000,000 subjects of the King-Emperor.

Although the idea of Imperial unity, which had its birth as a living issue about thirty years ago, has to-day so many supporters, it is still fraught with great problems and dangers which must be solved and overcome.

The question therefore arises, are these difficulties insuperable? Is the idea, glorious though it may be, wholly impracticable and never to be realised? Or, on the other hand, will the British people, true to their Anglo-Saxon origin and in accord with the glowing pages of centuries of history, at length solve the problems and successfully overcome the dangers before them? Greater difficulties than these have been overcome by the determination of men. Take, for example, the union of modern Germany and the Federation of the Austrian Empire, embracing as it does many nationalities diverse in their institutions, language and ideas. Furthermore, a most applicable example is the creation of the United States of America, the great work faced and overcome by our own kin, though fraught with the greatest difficulties encountered by man. It is to the United States that we should look as a guide, for they have solved the problem of Federal government over vast regions of territory. The North American Colonies, after their

struggle for independence, faced the great problem of a national destiny, with individual interests differing far more radically in their nature than those which we to-day are confronting. In spite, however, of the many local jealousies and conflicting interests, they finally, after a number of years of dissension and a precarious existence under the Articles of Confederation, solved the problem of union. The result was the Constitution of the United States of America, under which an efficient government was inaugurated in 1789, and which has been characterised by Gladstone as "the most wonderful work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man." No doubt the circumstances attendant upon the task of our American kin differed somewhat from those which face us to-day. But the fundamental principles and grand actuating motive is the same—an indissoluble union of indestructible States, a union of States independent of each other, in individual autonomy, but in their external aspect presenting one central and consolidated sovereignty. What was possible for them is possible for us.

The question, therefore, at issue for the British people soon to decide once and for all is, shall we continue to be an Empire increasing in wealth, expanding in trade and commerce, and all-powerful in war and peace; shall we endeavour to make the Empire politically a more homogeneous body, one such as the world has never seen, and one almost beyond the conception of man? Or shall we, on the other hand, gradually split up into a group of separate republics, each working out selfishly, apart from the others, its own destiny?

The majority of us believe in the Empire and hope for its continuance; but some, notably the devotees of "Peace at any price," at home and over the seas, seriously advocate the splitting up of this massive political machine, this great heritage committed to us by our forefathers. A policy such as this seems suicidal. The Empire united exerts a tremendous influence upon the outside world, and that influence is beneficent, its force being of a civilising nature, and many of its

institutions might with profit be taken as models to be followed by other nations.

The disintegration of the Empire would result in its component parts becoming independent communities, having to undertake all the responsibilities and obligations of independent States, maintaining armies and navies for their protection; for they would be faced by navies which have of late years grown abnormal in their strength owing to the lustful ambition of the Powers for colonial expansion; and this ambition may at any time be lashed into furious jealousy by the thought that many of the choicest spots on the globe have come under British dominion. In the old days war to the Colonies meant but temporary loss, while to-day the Dominions, if independent States, would be liable to fall under the intolerable yoke of some foreign Power. In former times, when the Colonies were but little developed, they offered but slight attractions to the rapacity of the Powers. The rapid growth of material prosperity has to-day changed this. The history of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, in regard to change of ownership, might repeat itself. More than ever to-day, therefore, do the Dominions need the powerful protection of the armaments of their motherland, and more than ever does the motherland need her Dominions.

The several units of the Empire to-day are certainly not strong or wealthy enough to stand alone, and if such a policy were inaugurated the result would be a collection of struggling republics and a further division of the British race.

This policy could only be pursued with dishonour and ingratitude to those who gave their lives for the founding of the British Empire. It was not for this that Wolfe fell on the Heights of Abraham, nor that Clive conquered India; it was not for this that Cecil Rhodes spent his life and his millions. The sacrifices of our forefathers were made to found an Empire which should be a civilising power. It was for the glory of the British people that the Heights of Abraham were

won; it was for the unity of the English-speaking peoples that Cecil Rhodes, the Empire builder, left his millions, a unity which but for the unstatesmanlike conduct of our ministers of the eighteenth century might have existed to-day.

The time has passed when we enjoyed the position of being far in advance of the rest of the world in strength, wealth, and trade. We are now meeting at all points competition, which yearly becomes keener and more severe. Jealousy of our success in war, in colonising, and in trade is widespread, and this feeling has been intensified by the smarting of old sores. So long as the Powers show bitterness and distrust among themselves, so long may we be in no fear of a coalition. The time may come, however, and it may be in the not distant future, when the Powers will forget, or at least for the time being lay aside their differences, in their zeal to bring about our downfall. If such a *contretemps* found the British Empire united and determined to defend its supremacy and uphold the command of the seas, then we should be in a position to fear nothing and be able to cope with any threatening coalition.

It is true that the past few years have witnessed a *rapprochement* between France and England. But our relations with the German Empire, it is to be regretted, are not, to say the least, so cordial. Signs and conditions about that Empire should cause our people some serious consideration. Germany, it is known, chafes at her comparative insignificance as a colonial Power, and does not view with equanimity her ever-expanding population finding an outlet in foreign countries. The Kaiser showed the aspirations of himself and his people when he said: "Our future lies on the sea." And Prince von Bülow, speaking in the Reichstag on the Navy Act of 1898, said: "It is not to be tolerated that any foreign Power should say to us, 'The world is disposed of'—we shall not permit any foreign Power to push us aside, whether in commerce or politics. Like the British, French, and the Russians, we also have a right to a Greater Germany."

But where is this Greater Germany to arise? The world, in spite of Prince von Bülow, is very nearly disposed of. But the German Empire each year brings out a greater naval programme, striving to outrival the British Empire, and the reason *why* should give food for serious thought.

In this connection it would be well to remember the motto of our American Colonists in the Revolutionary War, when Benjamin Franklin, at the signing of the Declaration of Independence, said: "United we stand, divided we fall!" Clearly our duty, as well as our salvation, demands that we preserve the integrity of the Empire, and in order to do this we must endeavour to draw nearer to one another. As Mr. Chamberlain once remarked: "The future of the world is not with petty States, but with mighty Empires." This, then, is the age for consolidation, for political trusts, for combining independent units into combinations or leagues, for the common protection and welfare of the partners. The consolidation of the Empire is proposed as a means of obtaining this end, and our duty as citizens of the Empire is to determine whether such a theory is feasible and beneficial.

By Imperial Federation is meant a method that will insure for all time our unity, strength, and security.

Unfortunately, it seems that all movements that have aimed at a change for the better are fated to be for ever misconstrued by many, and the doctrine of Imperial Federation is no exception to this rule. It is attacked chiefly from the belief that its adoption would seriously impair the local autonomy of the self-governing units. But that charge is, in the main, groundless. The local affairs of each part would be under the jurisdiction of the local parliaments. Possibly there might be one or two modifications in this regard, such as the control of the Customs, either partially or wholly, by the Imperial Government, in order to provide for the revenue and expenses of the Empire. A good example in this regard is the formation of the Australian Commonwealth. In

order to secure this union it was incumbent upon each of the Colonies to give up a certain amount of its provincial rights, such as the control of the Customs and the right of imposing protective duties against one another, and some other matters; yet at the same time the object of the Commonwealth Bill was sagaciously and broad-mindedly declared to be "to enlarge the powers of self-government of the people of Australia." The idea was, of course, that the rendition of these provincial rights was more than compensated for by the great benefits and opportunities obtained by a federal union.

How much more, therefore, can this be said to apply to an Imperial Federal union in which the Colonies would be raised from mere dependencies to a state of equality with their motherland, no more and no less? However, should it become necessary for the preservation of the Empire that the units agree to subordinate, in a particular case, local interests to the welfare of the whole, it is to be hoped that the broad-minded view will triumph. Should this some day be necessary, it must be admitted that it might prove a hindrance in attaining our ideal, as the several members are apt greatly to magnify their own claims and also to disregard, in a measure, the interests of others.

This, unfortunately, is likely to be the case, owing to the fact that the members are not contiguous, but are often separated by large stretches of water. But the rapid transit, both over sea and land, which we owe to steam and electricity, and the wonderful inventions of ocean cables and wireless telegraphy, which yearly draw us nearer to one another, may, it is to be hoped, overcome this difficulty.

The United States, under their Articles of Confederation, prior to the adoption of their Constitution, had to overcome this difficulty, for there the thirteen States had, as they supposed, radical differences. Washington, full of apprehension for the safety and continuance of the Union, addressed a circular to the governors of the several States, pleading with them to subordinate

their claims to the welfare of all, "as essential not only to the well-being, but to the existence, of the United States as an independent Power, an indissoluble union of the States under one common head"; a sacred regard to justice; the adoption of a proper peace establishment; and "the prevalence of that pacific and friendly disposition among the people of the United States which will induce them to forget their local prejudices and policies; to make these mutual concessions, which are requisite to the general prosperity; and, in some instances, to sacrifice their individual advantages to the interest of the community."

It is often hard for a Dominion to understand that an injury to one does affect all as a whole. It seems difficult for many people of the Dominion of Canada to realise the great necessity of the maintenance of British prestige in the Far East as against Russia, or even Japan. But is it such a matter of indifference to them as they imagine? A moment's reflection will give some idea of the effect on Canada's Pacific coastline should Russia or Japan supplant us in our position in that quarter of the world. It is also vital to the existence of Australasia that we enforce, for all time, a sort of "Monroe Doctrine" in the Persian Gulf. Thus it may readily be seen that the welfare of one is the concern of all, and that injury inflicted upon any part reverberates throughout the entire system.

The parties which would go to make up the Federation would be the United Kingdom, the Dominion of Canada, the Commonwealth of Australia, the Union of South Africa, the Dominion of New Zealand, and Newfoundland. The dependency of India, and the numerous Crown Colonies, though included in the Federation, would not have the status of States, but would rather resemble the position of the territories and possessions of the United States.

"The federation we aim at," said Lord Rosebery some years ago, "is the closest possible union of the various self-governing States, ruled by the British Crown, consistently with that free development which

is the birthright of British subjects all over the world—the closest union in sympathy, in external action, and in defence.”

CHAPTER III.

AN IMPERIAL COUNCIL.

MENTION has already been made in the opening chapter of the advisability of establishing some sort of Imperial Council or Grand Assembly of the Empire, which would endeavour to counteract some of the disadvantages of our present Imperial system. It will be the purpose of this chapter to examine into the question more thoroughly, and to seek what part, if any, such a Council might play in our Empire governance. What is aimed at in these chapters is to give a definite scheme of an Imperial Constitution, such as might eventually be adopted. That being so a Federal Parliament, and not an Advisory Council, is the author's idea of the eventual requirements of the British Empire. For present-day conditions, however, and as a stepping-stone towards closer union, some kind of deliberative body might prove most useful. For the problem which demands immediate solution is some means of bringing all the self-governing parts of the Empire together in matters requiring concerted action, without, however, encroaching upon local autonomy in any way. The Dominions are now prepared to appropriate money for their own defence and for that of the Empire as a whole; but they will undoubtedly resist the creation of any central body empowered to tax them. It is to be hoped for the future welfare of the Empire that such views may in time become modified.

Among the many who have advocated an Imperial Council may be mentioned the Duke of Argyll, Earl Grey, the late Mr. W. E. Forster, founder of the Imperial Federation League, Sir Frederick Pollock, and Sir Joseph Ward. Their views, in this regard, seem

similar to the paper read by Mr. Greswell before the London Chamber of Commerce in 1888, when he said :

“ The Imperial Assembly which we want must be an independent body, constitutional in its origin, representative in its character, and supreme in its decisions. Such a body we have already in existence in the Privy Council. Its members are chosen, irrespective of party considerations, from among the most eminent of those who have done service to the State. To this body Colonists of distinguished public service could be elected. In constituting the Imperial Committee of the Privy Council, representation might be given to every part of the Empire, in proportion to the several contributions to expenditure for Imperial defence.”

Since the first discussion of the question, by Earl Grey in the early 'eighties, there have been evolved four different schemes. One is the establishment of a permanent Imperial Committee of the Privy Council, a purely advisory body, having with it a permanent Bureau of Imperial Intelligence, to collect and codify all information regarding Imperial subjects. A second proposal is to have an enlarged Cabinet, another Cabinet for purely Imperial questions. To this enlarged Cabinet statesmen from the States oversea would be called. This body would be both advisory and executive in authority. It would have the virtue of indefinite expansion, and, in the process of evolution, the two Cabinets might become separated. A third, in a way similar to the second, came in 1906 from Mr. R. B. Wise, of New South Wales, who advocated that the High Commissioners of Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa should form a sub-committee of the Cabinet and be consulted on Imperial affairs. But these bodies would not be representative in character, and there would be little hope of their becoming so. The fourth scheme, that of a periodical Imperial Conference, which is in effect in being, meets this defect to some extent; but the trouble is that the Imperial Conference has neither permanent organisation nor executive powers, and is unrecognised by our Constitution.

These four proposals are all far from perfect. Perhaps the most satisfactory is the quadrennial Imperial Conference. This, at least, represents the Colonies in person, though most inadequately and indirectly. Something perhaps might be evolved by moulding these four proposals together. The Imperial Conference might be woven into the Cabinet, making it of an Imperial character. At the beginning, the Imperial Cabinet would be only the Cabinet of the United Kingdom, with the addition of a few Colonial statesmen; but in a process of evolution the Imperial and local characters of the Cabinet might become separated. Its Imperial character would then take upon itself the administration of the Empire, and its local character would resume business for the government of the United Kingdom. The Imperial Cabinet would then account both to the Parliament of the United Kingdom and the Parliaments of the daughter States.

Meanwhile something more is needed: a permanent Imperial Committee of the Privy Council to assist the Imperial Cabinet. This would be a purely consultative body debating between the sessions of the Imperial Cabinet the same questions as would be dealt with by that Cabinet, and assisting the Cabinet of the United Kingdom on anything of a pressing Imperial nature. The Imperial Conference of 1907 made a step forward, slight progress though it may be deemed to be, when it initiated the idea of a permanent Imperial Commission—an Intelligence Department for the Imperial Conference, under the control of the Colonial Office.

But a conference every four years is not sufficient, and prevents a continuity of policy. An Imperial Conference to be of any real use must be an annual affair. Hitherto the Conference has been a meeting for the most part of Prime Ministers, and it is for that reason apparently that it has not met annually. But such an assembly need not necessarily be attended by the Prime Ministers of the several States, though they undoubtedly should be members of that body. Where inconvenience was experienced in attending the Conference by a Prime

Minister his deputy could take his place. But there are so many questions requiring discussion now every year that something must be done. Questions of naval programmes and combined manœuvres, common training, exchange of units, identical matériel, besides in the near future many details involving Imperial Trade Preference.

Working under these foregoing suggestions we would then have in our Government, first, an Imperial Cabinet, composed at the commencement of the Cabinet of the United Kingdom, with Colonial statesmen, and sitting periodically in an Imperial Conference; secondly, an advisory permanent Imperial Committee of the Privy Council, which would be assisted by (thirdly) an Imperial Intelligence Department with a permanent secretariat.

Such a Council in the beginning, at least, would be purely deliberative and advisory, in no way legislative. Its members, part of the year resident in London, would nevertheless be in close and constant communication with their several Dominions, and each part of the Empire would thus be in no danger of having its opinions ignored. Its chief capacity would be advising the several Governments of the Empire on matters of inter-Imperial concern requiring joint or uniform action.

The principal questions which would constantly come under review by the Council would be Imperial defence, foreign policy, trade, finance, ocean cables, postage, emigration, shipping and navigation, and any and all matters of Imperial concern.

But such a Council, with nominated representatives, debating on important Imperial questions, is the principle of Norman government, a Parliament being that of the Anglo-Saxon. It is true that the present Imperial Parliament is in a measure derived from the Privy Council of our Norman sovereigns, and therefore it might be said to develop eventually into a proper Federal Parliament. But that derivation is confined to the Upper House, the House of Lords, and not to the popular body, the House of Commons. Yet a House of Commons was

finally developed, and therefore in time the Imperial Council might expand into a bicameral Imperial Parliament.

Before we had made that much progress, however, the Imperial Council might have developed into a useful makeshift for transacting the business of the Empire. It might, under a confederation and pending a more satisfactory federation, assume functions similar to those of the Council of Delegations of the Austro-Hungarian Empire. That empire, however, is not a federation; it can hardly even be called a confederation. It is little more than a permanent association of two independent States. The empire has no common Constitution and no common executive. All questions of customs and of the naval and military forces have to be governed by specified treaties for the same, drawn up jointly in the separate Parliaments of Austria and Hungary. The defects of this system, however, are realised by none more keenly than the subjects of that empire themselves. Were the British Empire to adopt this as a permanent scheme for Imperial unity it would before long likely find itself in as unsatisfactory a state as did the United States under their Articles of Confederation prior to the founding of their wonderful Constitution. Such a condition would not mean federation, but at most a brittle confederation, incapable of withstanding great shocks. As a temporary scheme of Imperial unity there is a good deal to be said in its favour, so long as it is realised that it would be only temporary—a mere stage in our political evolution as an Empire.

Possibly the process of evolution may have begun with the Colonial Conference which met occasionally. This then evolved into a regular quadrennial occurrence, which after became changed to an Imperial Conference, and with which later there was added a permanent secretariat. This again in turn might develop into an Imperial Council, still meeting every four years, with, of course, the permanent secretariat. The Imperial Council might then subsequently change to an annual affair

and become part of the Imperial machinery of government. Finally, it might expand into a true Federal Imperial Parliament, composed of an Upper and Lower House, establishing an Imperial Constitution, thus graduating from confederation to federation—making the Empire from a Staatenbund into a Bundesstaat. This, after all, is probably the way federation will come. We are a conservative people and are slow to change. We incline rather toward evolution than revolution. Let us trust that the process has really begun.

CHAPTER IV.

THE SOVEREIGN AND HIS TITLE.

BY the British Constitution, the supreme executive power of the Empire is vested in a single person, a king or queen. This has become so by the general consent of the people. The Crown is by our common law and constitutional custom hereditary in its nature. But history tells that this has not always been the case, for the right of inheritance has more than once been changed and limited by an Act of Parliament, under which change, however, the Crown continued hereditary in the new proprietor.

Monarchical forms of government have always of necessity been either hereditary or elective. In theory it would seem that an elective monarchy would be the most in accord with the rational principles of government, and more favourable to the liberty and welfare of society as against one hereditary in character. The chiefs or princes of the ancients, in the commencement of their rude principles of government, were for the most part elected. We have, however, unfortunately not yet reached that ideal state of existence where all who compose the State are actuated only by just and patriotic motives, are incorruptible, devoid of passion and prejudice, and have the highest reverence for the

public peace, as against the violence and riotous behaviour which from time immemorial have, and do now, often characterise the elections to office. If it were possible, that he who is most deserving of his fellow men could obtain the Crown, then indeed would an elective monarchy be an ideal institution. The example of ancient times in Rome and the experiences of the eighteenth century in Germany and Poland, and even present-day conditions, show it to be otherwise. Furthermore, under a republican form of government the affairs of the country are unsettled every few years by the elections for a chief magistrate. This evil is non-existent under a limited monarchy, the idea being that "Le Roi est mort, vive Le Roi" is applicable, when it is considered that the successor to the Crown becomes vested with that office with an absence of all trouble and excitement. When the lamentable intelligence was announced that King Edward VII. was dead and that his Majesty George V. was therefore King, business and the Empire's affairs went on the same as ever.

In theory, then, an elective monarchy or republic is ideal; but in practice it must give place to the greatest and best form of government at present existing, that of a limited monarchy, of the kind which the peoples of this Empire now enjoy. But there are some who think that the days of monarchies will soon be past and that republican forms of government should be substituted in place thereof. The several governments forming the Empire, however, are to all intents and purposes republics in nature though not in name. The British Empire to-day is in reality the greatest republic that ever existed. It has all the advantages of a republic and is free from many of its great evils. In like manner it has the advantage of a monarchy with but few, if any, of its disadvantages. The idea of the British throne is that its occupant rules but does not govern. The throne, then, inspires in all a sentiment which binds us together in our common allegiance. It exerts a great influence upon those alien races in

our Indian Empire and elsewhere, and sheds a lustre and brilliancy over the whole. It raises the tone of society generally, and its Court is a sign for all that is brilliant, great, and cultured in a nation. Above all, there exists a supreme head which is aloof from the fierce contests of party politics, which is well-nigh impossible in the executive head of a republic.

One of the cardinal changes which would be rendered proper by a federation of the Empire would be a change in the status of the Sovereign and the form of his title, for then the several States would be fused into one supreme political body having a Federal Legislature; there would then be an Empire, as united as the Empires of Germany, Austria, or Russia; as united, politically, though not geographically, but of the same status as those empires. The supreme executive power of such a federation or empire should then be in the hands of an emperor, no longer in those of a king, owing to the change in the status of the British Dominions, from a United Kingdom with Colonies and dependencies to that of a United and Federal Empire.

It may be asserted that the title of "king" is as high and as wide as "emperor." In that case "kingdom" is as high and wide as "empire." But Great Britain and Ireland, India, Canada, Australia, and South Africa cannot properly be called the British Kingdom without venturing on absurdity, for the very concrete reason that "king" and "kingdom" is narrower and less elevated than "emperor" and "empire."

The title of emperor in the Middle Ages was, as witnessed by the Holy Roman Empire, far more exalted than that of king. It incurred a sovereignty over Kings, and even the power of creating them. This imperial title, though great to-day, was even considered much greater in the Middle Ages, from the fact of an emperor being held to be the Vice-Regent of God on earth, in temporal matters. Thus, according to the Holy Roman Empire, there could be only one emperor, and kings were considered but his officers.

But this suggestion of a change in the status of the Crown will assuredly be attacked by many as revolutionary, with doing away with the time-honoured title of king, one most foreign to arbitrary ideas, military despotism; most in accord with what constitutes legislative freedom and constitutional monarchy, and in fact most congenial to the instincts and feelings of the British nation. The more modern title of emperor would be substituted, a title foreign to these realms, and one which is often associated with absolute monarchy, tyrannical government, and the encroachment of the rights and liberties of the people.

This, however, is by no means so, and history will show that the imperial is of greater origin than the royal style. To begin with, the greater part of what is now known as England and Wales formed an important part of the Roman Empire for nearly four hundred years previous to a Saxon king gaining the land. And Britain as an integral part of the Roman Empire received her literature, language, laws, science, arts, architecture, and civilisation. Cities like London and Eboracum grew up and became identified with all that contained Roman culture, and in style and mode of living London became another Rome. During this régime five of the emperors came to visit Britain. Three of them resided at York (Eboracum), two of them died there, while the greatest of all was born there, whose mother, the Empress Helena, was also British and of royal descent. Victoria, Empress of the West, is supposed to have resided in London about A.D. 267.

To have produced Constantine the Great, who was one of the greatest soldiers and statesmen the world has seen, is something for Britain to be proud of. It was he also who was the first emperor to put down the persecutions of Christians and to embrace that faith himself and to proclaim it the religion of the whole empire. Later the great West Saxon kings also held the title of emperor, or rather Basileus of Britain, the name Basileus being the Greek equivalent of Imperator.

This imperial title was used in reference to the paramountcy of the West Saxon sovereigns, as over-lords over certain parts not directly forming the Kingdom of England, as for example the principalities of Wales. The imperial title was also adopted by Canute and the Norman and Angevin dynasties, though the title was not on the coinage later than the time of John. The title of emperor though great to-day was even considered much greater in the Middle Ages, from the fact of an emperor being held to be the Vice-Regent of God on earth in temporal matters. The Scottish people in the time of Bruce acknowledged King Edward as "Lord and Emperor."

In 1707 the two Kingdoms of England and Scotland were united under the name of Great Britain, and in 1801 the Kingdoms of Great Britain and Ireland were united into one kingdom under the name of the "United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland," and the Crown thereof by law called "The Imperial Crown of the said United Kingdom, and of the dominions thereunto belonging," while it was left to the reigning sovereign to assume whatever title he preferred. For the law provides by 39 and 40 Geo. III. cap. 67 "That the Royal style and title appertaining to the Imperial crown of the said United Kingdom and its dependencies, shall be such as his Majesty, by his Royal Proclamation under the great seal of the United Kingdom, shall be pleased to appoint." He might, therefore, have called himself "Emperor" had he so desired, and there is no reason why his Majesty may not now call himself "Emperor" if he should so desire.

The British Empire is, at the commencement of this century, the greatest empire which the world has known. The Roman and Holy Roman Empires in their prime never equalled it. More than four hundred millions in Europe, Asia, Africa, Australia, and America bear allegiance to George V. Should not this, the greatest of empires, be entitled to an Emperor? There was at one time the Roman Emperor. Why not to-day have the British Emperor? Certainly the enjoyment

of such a title by his Majesty would seem far more consistent than that enjoyed by Francis II. For, to use the epigram of Voltaire, "The Holy Roman Empire was neither holy, Roman, nor an empire."

The sovereign of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland is also sovereign of what is called the British Empire, having in addition the title of Emperor of India. The United Kingdom, being the Mother Country, and, therefore, for many years to come the strongest member in the Empire, would also be the most important member in the Federation. It might be advisable to follow the procedure of Germany and Prussia by conferring on the sovereign the dual capacity of Emperor for the whole British Empire, and, also continuing as, King of Great Britain and Ireland.

The title for the executive head might be, for example, George V., by the Grace of God, of the Britannic Empire, King and Emperor, Defender of the Faith. As to the exact wording of the title, that would be a matter of detail to be fixed by Parliament; but it would logically and theoretically appear to be essential that the supreme head be raised to the status of an emperor ruling over a United Empire. It would be symbolical, and a magnificent example of the creation of a new British Empire more powerful even than the old, and would cause the rest of the world to recognise the rise of a new political Power second to none in the ranks of the nations.

PART II.

CHAPTER I.

THE PARLIAMENT OF THE BRITISH EMPIRE.

THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

UNDoubtedly the most important consideration to be given in the formation of a Britannic Federation is that of a Parliament or Council whereby the units would each be represented in all that concerns them as a whole. If it is found that such a legislature will be possible, both from a theoretical and practical standpoint, the greatest problem in regard to a Britannic Federation will be solved, and the other problems and difficulties will, in comparison, be considered easy of solution. To begin with, it will be well to determine the parliamentary system of government under which the Empire exists to-day.

The supreme power of government in the British Empire is divided into two branches : First, legislative, consisting of the King and an Upper and Lower House ; secondly, executive, which theoretically consists of the King alone. The supreme legislative power of the British Empire is by its Constitution given to Parliament. "The power and jurisdiction of Parliament," says Sir Edward Coke, "is so transcendent and absolute that it cannot be confined, either for causes or persons, within any bounds." By our Constitution we know that the Sovereign is the head of Parliament, and he alone can summon it. It is also a branch of the Royal Prerogative that no Parliament can be convened by its own authority, but by the King alone, save on his demise, when it can then assemble of its own accord. Parliament is regularly summoned by the King's writ,

issued out of Chancery by advice of the Privy Council, at least thirty-five days before it assembles.

The great advantage which we have derived from our Constitution is that all parts of our Government are mutual checks upon one another. In the legislature the Lower House, representing the people, is a check on the Upper, and the Upper is a check upon the Lower, while the executive head is a check upon both. Again, the executive power is also checked and kept within due bounds by the two Houses forming the legislature.

Strictly speaking, however, Parliament must be considered not only as the two Houses of Lords and Commons but as the King, Lords and Commons. This must always be considered the proper composition of Parliament, excepting probably in viewing the past conflicts between the Sovereign and Parliament. Sir Edward Creasy, in his book on "The Constitutions of the Britannic Empire," thus speaks on this point: "It may be useful to premise that the word 'Parliament' is used here not in the sense which it often bears in constitutional histories and treatises, when limitations on Royal authority are discussed. The word 'Parliament' in such cases frequently means the two Houses of Lords and Commons as contradistinguished from the Crown. But in the complete and correct sense of the word 'Parliament' means a Parliament composed of King, Lords and Commons. The co-operation of the Sovereign in parliamentary proceedings with regard to the Colonies and other trans-marine regions of the Britannic Empire is as essential (save as to parliamentary impeachment) as that of either of the Houses." This body in its inception was the Parliament of the Kingdom of England founded in its present shape in the thirteenth century.

The preceding centuries witnessed the expansion of England on the Continent of Europe, in Ireland and Scotland. Indeed, for some time the King of England ruled over more French territory than the King of France himself. After the taking of Calais that town

returned members to the House of Commons, and continued to do so until the reign of Mary, when Calais was retaken by the French, thus losing to the English Crown its last foothold in France. In the reign of Elizabeth Lord Bacon endeavoured to bring about a union of the kingdoms of England and Scotland, which latter, in spite of the accession of the Stuarts to the English throne, did not fully transpire until in 1707 by the Statute of 6 Anne it was provided, "That on the first of May, 1707, and forever after, the kingdoms of England and Scotland shall be united into one kingdom, by the name of Great Britain; and further that the united kingdom shall be represented by one Parliament."

For several centuries Ireland had been a dependency of the English Crown, during which time it had been subject to internal war and rebellion among the different sections of the population. James I., owing to these causes, established an Irish Parliament after the manner of the Parliament of England, but this institution did not for many years meet with success.

In the year 1799, therefore, "in pursuance of his Majesty's most gracious recommendation to the two Houses of Parliament of Great Britain and Ireland respectively to consider of such measures as might best tend to strengthen and consolidate the connection between the two kingdoms, the two Houses of Parliament in each country resolved that in order to promote the strength, power, and resources of the British Empire, it was advisable to concur in such measures as should best tend to unite the two kingdoms into one kingdom, on such terms and conditions as should be established by the acts of the respective Parliaments in the two countries. And, in furtherance of that resolution, the two Houses of each Parliament agreed upon eight articles, which, by an address of the respective Houses of Parliament, were laid before his Majesty for his consideration; and his Majesty, having approved of the same, and having recommended it to his Parliaments in Great Britain and Ireland to give full effect to them,

they were ratified by an Act passed in the Parliament of Great Britain on the 2nd of July, 1800."

It was then enacted by the Statute 39 and 40 George III. c. 67, "That the kingdoms of Great Britain and Ireland shall, on the first day of January, 1801, and forever after, be united into one kingdom, by the name of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland.

. . . Further, that there shall be one Parliament, styled the Parliament of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland."

With the adoption of the new Colonial system, based on Lord Durham's report for Canada, the fullest powers of self-government were conferred upon those Colonies which were fitted for it. Therefore, besides this Imperial body there are to-day in the several British Dominions parliaments having powers of legislation for local affairs. There is in Canada a Federal Parliament for the Dominion, consisting of a Governor-General, a Senate, and a House of Commons, created in the year 1867 by an Act of the Imperial Parliament, which also provided for the confederation of Newfoundland with the Dominion. This has, however, not yet taken place. There are also provincial legislatures in the various provinces whose existence dates back prior to confederation.

In 1901, by an Act of the Imperial Parliament, the several Colonies of Australia were formed into a Commonwealth, having a Federal Parliament, consisting of a Governor-General, a Senate, and a House of Representatives. This did not do away with the local legislatures of the several Colonies, or, as they are now termed, original States. The Parliament of New Zealand, made up of a Governor and a General Assembly, consisting of two Chambers, a Legislative Council, and House of Representatives, was created by an Act of the Imperial Parliament in 1852.

Finally, by an Act of the Imperial Parliament, the South African Colonies were federated on April 31, 1910. South Africa now consists of a Governor-General, a Senate, and a House of Representatives.

Of course, in addition to these assemblies there are numerous legislative bodies of varying powers in the Crown Colonies and Dependencies ; but these could not likely obtain the status of States in a prospective Federal union for some years to come.

Thus, we see that the supreme legislative power in the Empire is at present vested in the British Parliament, also known as the Imperial Parliament, to which all the other Legislatures are constitutionally subordinate. But the Imperial Parliament is not Imperial in the proper sense of the word, being in reality but the Parliament of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, the other British Dominions not being represented in that body.

Our present political system, whereby a fifth of the British people are not represented in those matters which are common to all, has long caused surprise to philosophical and political writers. The principle that the British people beyond the seas should be represented in the councils of the Empire has long been held in the past by some of our foremost statesmen and by writers on political economy. It is only within the last few years that the idea has become practicable. It may be interesting to survey briefly the proposals for Colonial representation made in the past.

In 1754, Shirley, the Imperial Governor of Massachusetts, proposed to Benjamin Franklin "the plan of uniting the Colonies more intimately with Great Britain by allowing them representatives in Parliament." At that time Franklin opposed the idea. Later, in 1768, Otis, one of the greatest supporters of the rights of the American Colonies, strongly advocated a general union of the British Empire, in which every part of its wide dominion should be represented under one equal and uniform direction and system of laws." In England both Grenville and Adam Smith advocated the idea of representatives from the Colonies in Parliament. On March 22, 1775, Burke, in his great speech in the House of Commons, spoke on this question in the following words : " You will now, perhaps, imagine that I am

on the point of proposing to you a scheme for a representation of the Colonies in Parliament. Perhaps I might be inclined to entertain some such thought; but a great flood stops me in my course. *Opposuit natura*—I cannot remove the eternal barriers of the creation. The thing in that mode I do not know to be possible. As I meddle with no theory I do not absolutely assert the impracticability of such a representation. But I do not see my way to it, and those who have been more confident have not been more successful.”

A great objection on the part of the Colonies, at that period, besides the objection of distance, appears to have been their distrust of the Parliament of Great Britain itself, because of its then venality and corruption. These objections, both to distance and to the corrupt methods of Parliament before the Reform Bills, exist no longer. Modern invention has annihilated distance, and the Imperial Parliament to-day maintains undoubtedly the highest standard of integrity and honesty of any legislature the world over.

During the debates in Parliament in 1831-32 on the Reform Bill, the subject of Colonial representation was again revived by a motion brought forward to that effect on 16th August, 1831, by Mr. Joseph Hume, Liberal M.P. for Middlesex. The motion was negatived without a division. But though it is not generally known, the Colonies, in one sense of the word, actually were represented in Parliament, both before the Reform Bill and for many years after, though such representation was in no way official. The Colonies employed Members of Parliament as their paid agents in order to express their views, and, if possible, guard their interests. Thus, Edmund Burke was the agent for New York from 1770 to 1775, being paid a salary of £500 a year by that Colony; and Mr. Roebuck was at one time agent for Canada.

Upon the final consolidation of the Empire, therefore, it would be necessary to have a central political organisation in many respects resembling the Congress of the United States and the Parliaments of Canada and

Australia. This would entail a change in the status of the Parliament of the United Kingdom, if such a change by evolution had not already occurred. This is absolutely essential to any lasting scheme of national unity by federation, being indeed rendered necessary by our representative institutions. The governing principles in any idea of federation must be the separation of Imperial from local affairs in parliamentary government. Such ideas as oversea representation in the Parliament of the United Kingdom ought to be banished for obvious reasons. Already Parliament is overburdened with the present amount of business it vainly attempts to transact each session. The introduction of more Colonial questions would then only aggravate the difficulty, and, on the other hand, it would be unreasonable to expect members from the Dominions, who had come several thousands of miles, to listen to exhaustive debates on some petty local matter concerning some particular part of the Kingdom. Such a procedure would, moreover, mar the symmetry of the Federal polity, one of the chief characteristics and advantages of the true Federal State being the segregation of national and local matters. The United Kingdom, the most important member, would be in a more undeveloped parliamentary state than the other States of the federation, which, in addition to their participation in Imperial legislation, would also have local Parliaments. The logical requirement, therefore, is a purely central body, taking its place at the head of a system progressing from the provincial legislatures up through the Dominion Parliaments to this truly Imperial body.

This would no doubt entail considerable opposition from many who would find it hard to agree to the Mother of Parliaments giving up her Imperial status and becoming again, as she was before, the Parliament of the United Kingdom. In that case, the present Imperial Parliament, of course, could be reformed in such a manner to be in keeping with her new Imperial status, and a statutory Parliament could be instituted which would then deal with the local affairs of the kingdom.

From a sentimental point of view it would no doubt seem fitting that the original Parliament of England, which expanded into the Parliament of Great Britain, and later into the Parliament of Great Britain and Ireland, should still further on in her existence eventually become the Federal Parliament of the British Empire. Yet this would scarcely be as advisable as the former. In the first place, to render it a proper Imperial Federal Parliament its reform would have to be very extensive, for what may be fairly well suited to the conditions of the United Kingdom would not in many ways be suited to the condition of the British Empire. It is to be doubted whether the people in the States across the sea would consent to the House of Lords—at any rate, as at present constituted—as part of the Federal Parliament. Certainly, the Established Church of England should not be represented in such a body, for the Church is in no way part of the State in Canada, Australia, or South Africa. It would really seem that the present Imperial Parliament should remain as constituted—the Parliament of Great Britain and Ireland, with its Established Church—for it is more bound up with the annals and traditions of the three kingdoms than it is with the rest of the Empire. The establishment of a new local Parliament, devoid of any traditions, for the British people at home would not in many ways work as well. It would, therefore, in face of these considerations, be much simpler and easier to create a new legislative body for the Empire which would mark the birth of the new British Empire and its many changes in its system. But there is no doubt that opposition to this would be both considerable and powerful, for many would be loath to see the Mother of Parliaments take a subordinate position.

James Anthony Froude considered this proposition hopeless, and wrote in his "Oceana" thus: "Another project has been suggested; I know not whether I need mention it. A new Parliament—a Federal Parliament, composed of representatives from all parts of the Empire—is to sit side by side with the existing Parlia-

ment and relieve it of the charge of foreign and colonial policy. The Ministry will have to be chosen from this new Parliament. On it will fall the decision of all questions of peace or war. Therefore, it will have the overruling voice in the taxation which its Acts may make necessary. The House of Commons is now omnipotent. No man, or body of men, has been known yet to relinquish voluntary powers of which it was in present possession. Who is to persuade the House of Commons to abdicate half its functions and construct a superior authority which would reduce it to the level of a municipal board? What force short of revolution and soldiers' bayonets would bring them to it? Of all the amateur propositions hitherto brought forward this of a Federal Parliament is the most chimerical and absurd."

With all due deference to that great historian, Froude overestimated the difficulties. In the first place, if the people of the United Kingdom saw that the existence of the Empire would depend upon the construction of a suitable Parliament representing the whole British race they would force their representatives to consider that proposition favourably. And the patriotism, not to speak of the necessity, would, if imperative to the existence of the Empire, bring about such a change. As to the Parliament of the United Kingdom then being reduced to the level of a municipal board, that is, to say the least, great exaggeration. Our Parliament, it is true, would under such conditions, become the local Parliament of the United Kingdom, in the same rank with the Parliaments of the Dominions. No one of knowledge will say, however, that the functions and importance of those great Parliaments are on a level with an English municipal board. It must be frankly admitted that there would be difficulties—great difficulties—which would militate against the establishment of a proper Parliament for the British nation. These difficulties might be surmounted and one's susceptibilities calmed by some logical and theoretical procedure which will now be considered.

First, it is a recognised principle of our Constitution that Parliament is absolute. As Sir Edward Coke laid it down : " The power and jurisdiction of Parliament is so transcendent and absolute that it cannot be confined, either for causes or persons, within any bounds." In that case the logical conclusion to be reached is that it is capable of doing anything. It is, therefore, able to resolve itself into two distinct Parliaments.

Burke, in his discourse on the functions of Parliament, thus speaks : " The Parliament of Great Britain sits at the head of her extensive Empire in two capacities. One is the local legislature of this island, providing for all things at home immediately, and by no other instrument than the executive power ; the other, and I think her nobler capacity, is what I call her Imperial character, in which, as from the throne of heaven, she superintends all the several inferior legislatures and guides and controls them all, without annihilating any."

It would be perfectly logical to separate these two distinct capacities, and therefore it would be theoretically correct and possible for the Mother of Parliaments to divide herself into two distinct Parliaments.

The first, which would still theoretically be the British Parliament, would be formed from her Imperial capacity, and would become the Federal Parliament of the British Empire, constituted in a manner requisite to the new conditions. The second would be formed from her local capacity, and would become the local Parliament of the United Kingdom. This would, to all intents and purposes, be the Parliament of the United Kingdom of to-day, though shorn of its Imperial status. From a practical standpoint this would be no different from that heretofore proposed—that of establishing a separate organisation, Imperial in its character, apart from the present one, which would then become local. But from a theoretical viewpoint it would be different, for by this procedure the Federal Parliament would be the same Parliament that granted the powers of self-government to the Colonies. It would be the logical

outcome of the Parliament of England, subsequently expanding into the Parliament of Great Britain, then later becoming the Imperial Parliament of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, finally expanding into the true Federal Parliament of the British Empire. It would, therefore, from a practical standpoint, make no difference which way we went about it; but the latter procedure would possibly smooth over the susceptibilities of some who would consider that the grand old historic Parliament was going to be destroyed.

The new fabric then created for the Federal Empire, and known as the Imperial Parliament, should be fashioned as much as possible after the present Imperial Parliament. That is, it should be composed of two Houses—a House of Commons and a Senate—and its mode of procedure and many of its customs would be the same.

Attention should now be given as to the constitution of the Imperial House of Commons. In constitutional theory the House of Commons represented all the Commons of England, and, latterly, all of the United Kingdom. By the statute 49, Henry III., the House of Commons has been made up of knights of the shire, or representatives of counties, of citizens, or representatives of cities, and of burgesses or representatives of boroughs, all of whom vote together. This idea of the Lower House representing all the Commons in the kingdom has, however, in practice never been fully realised. The Reform Bills of 1832, 1867, 1884, and the Redistribution Act of 1885, have now practically made this idea a fact by a most liberal extension of the franchise to the citizen.

The first consideration in this connection will be the proportion of representation for the several States which would form the federation. It will undoubtedly be agreed that the only proper method for representation in the Lower House would be on a basis of population. Such is the basis adopted in the present Imperial House of Commons, though there are some modifica-

tions in this respect. In regard to the size of the Imperial House of Commons, it would be advisable to have a somewhat limited membership, thereby making it compact and rendering it efficient and able to go through its business with dispatch. As the white population of the Empire increased so would the numbers in the Commons; but it would be well to start with a limited number, which could then be adjusted every ten years. The House of Representatives of the United States, which is part of the Federal Legislature, in 1912 contained 436 members, with a population of 91,972,265, being at the rate of one Congressman for every 210,945.5 people. The white population of the British Empire, being about sixty millions, it might be well to start with a membership of about 240. This would then be on a basis of one member for every 250,000, which, for the sake of argument, can be made arbitrary.

It might be found advisable to adopt a pivotal number of representatives for the United Kingdom, somewhat after the method pursued in the Constitution of Canada, whereby Quebec received a given number in order to preserve her individuality. This will then preserve the United Kingdom when the population of Canada and Australia will not only be equal to but greater than the Mother Country. However, that is an open question, and will not be considered in this present inquiry of apportionment, which will be based according to the present population of each community.

The United Kingdom for some time to come, like Prussia, would be the most important member in such a union. According to the latest estimate, the population is about forty-five millions. This would give to England, Wales, Ireland, and Scotland one hundred and eighty members.

In the self-governing Dominions it is estimated that there are about fifteen million whites of British or European descent. This would give a membership to the oversea States of sixty members. This number,

however, would steadily increase, as the population in the Dominions is augmenting at a rapid rate.

But it is a question whether those States, like Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa should not be given some extra representation in order to compensate them in a measure for their great distance from the capital of the Empire. It would be less convenient for them than it would be for the United Kingdom to attend Parliament.

In this plan of representation the Crown Colonies and Dependencies cannot be embraced, inasmuch as it is still necessary for their affairs to be administered by the Crown, and, further, the white population is generally small. These Dependencies also vary much in size and importance, and are scattered over the globe, their chief value often being of a strategic nature. Some of the larger and more important, politically and commercially, could, when sufficiently developed, enter the Federation as States in some such manner as the territories of the United States and Canada. The status of the Crown Colonies and several Dependencies in the British Empire should be rather similar to that of the position of the territories and Dependencies of the United States of America, and, in like manner, should have the privilege of sending delegates to the Imperial House to take part in debates on questions affecting their interests, though they should be debarred from voting.

The status of India, the greatest dependency in the Empire—an Empire in itself—would have to remain the same as to-day. It would be impossible to take her into the Federation as a State, thereby giving her popular government. Her people for probably several centuries to come would not be fitted for it. Many opponents of Federation argue that India stands to-day as the greatest obstacle in the attainment of our ideal. It is hard to understand why this should be. The administration of the government of India would remain the same as to-day, subject, of course, to alterations when necessary for the welfare of her people.

Supervision would merely be transferred to the Imperial Federal Parliament. She should, in common with the other Dependencies, also have the privilege of sending delegates to the Imperial Parliament on questions affecting her interests. These delegates could be nominated by the Viceroy-in-Council.

Those who would form the electorate in the several States should have some interest in the community in which they reside, which should be larger than is now often necessary for participation in local elections. Were the Imperial franchise held by the entire community, the ignorant and irresponsible, an influence fraught with grave danger would have to be reckoned with in the government of the Empire. Manhood suffrage is in theory a magnificent ideal, but unfortunately when put into practice very often works great mischief. It would be ideal if every white citizen in the Empire could step up and register his vote, but unfortunately we have not yet reached that happy state of existence where all are endowed plentifully with a good education and are actuated only by the best and most honourable motives. The evidences of political corruption, though not always capable of demonstration in communities where manhood suffrage has been fully realised, render its success at least doubtful. There should, therefore, be some qualification of education and property for those composing the electorate, which, with regard to property, could be respectively fixed to suit local conditions; for it would be hard to make this qualification uniform, inasmuch as the value of money varies considerably in the different parts of the Empire. The Imperial franchise should be extended to all natural born or naturalised white British subjects who possess a property qualification (the amount respectively to be fixed), either freehold or leasehold; or a university degree; or who are in Holy Orders; or who are members of the several learned professions.

The question of payment of Members of Parliament also arises. Outside of the United Kingdom the

members of the several colonial legislatures nearly always receive a yearly salary for their services. In the British House of Commons the question has several times arisen as to the advisability of payment for Members of Parliament. In the case of an Imperial Federal Parliament such a course would be not only wise but necessary, for it would be an injustice to ask men to come from a distant State to London and devote all their time and energy without compensation of any sort. Of course, with wealthy members this would be immaterial. The Imperial Government would undoubtedly be more stable by having men of means in the legislature who would, from purely patriotic and disinterested motives, give up their time for the benefit of their country and Empire. Yet we must remember that such a policy would deprive us of the services of many of the best minds, who would, owing to lack of means, be deterred from entering.

It would seem expedient, therefore, that a fixed salary be provided to be paid out of the Imperial Exchequer to all members, the exact amount of which would be a matter of detail, calling for some discussion. It might be suggested, however, that one thousand pounds a year for each member would be a fair salary, and would enable a man to maintain his position with proper dignity as a Member of the Imperial Parliament. In regard to members who came from a distant State, it might prove advisable to augment that sum as compensation for the great distance. For obvious reasons it would be expedient that the Imperial Government provide for the travelling expenses of the members to and from Parliament. This might be done in various ways. Each member might be allowed a certain mileage for sea and for land out of the Imperial Exchequer. But, preferably, the Imperial Government might enter into arrangements with the railways and steamship companies of the Empire whereby a member would be transported in the performance of official duties without personal expense. It might also prove advisable to revive the "franking" system to members

of either Imperial House, to extend telegraphic facilities for their public and private correspondence during their Parliamentary duties, and to provide for public correspondence out of session. This might be arranged by the Imperial Government as a return for the subsidies paid to the steamship and cable companies, thereby creating no new expense upon the Empire.

Under this scheme of an Imperial Parliament peers of the realm should be eligible for a seat in either House in this body, after the manner of Irish P^éers, who are now eligible for the House of Commons of the United Kingdom. For it is often a great hardship for a member of the House of Commons of the United Kingdom, on succeeding to a peerage, to have to leave that body when he may have set his mind on a political career therein. Should a peer be returned to a seat in the Lower House he might, while holding his seat, be denied the privilege of peerage; but that is a matter of minor importance.

CHAPTER II.

THE SENATE.

WE have enjoyed for centuries, by our Constitution, the idea of two houses in a Legislature, and without going into a deep discussion as to whether this is advantageous or otherwise, it may safely be asserted that it has proved so. If the Constitutions of the leading States of Europe and America that have representative government are considered, it will be seen that in all the Constitution provides for a bicameral legislature. The reason for this is obvious. The Lower House, representing the people, is prone to be swayed by popular passions and prejudices, and thereby to enact unwise and hasty legislation. An Upper House affords a check upon the sometimes radical measures of the more popular body. In all representative governments it has been found necessary to provide for

such a conservatively constituted body, to protect the people from themselves, and to preserve the country from headlong popular tyranny. In tracing the history of Parliament, we find that the Upper House, known as the House of Lords, in Great Britain, and its counterpart, the Senate, in Greater Britain, is of earlier origin than is the lower body, the House of Commons. (The modern House of Lords and Senate grew out of the Council of our Saxon ancestors known as the Wittenagemote or the Meeting of Wise Men. It was also known as the Michel-synoth or Great Council, and Michel-gemote or Great Meeting. But, generally speaking, our Parliament, as it now exists, was founded in the reign of King John, by virtue of the Magna Carta, from which is traced the real growth of the British Constitution.)

The House of Lords has for centuries been made up of the King's Majesty, sitting there in his royal political capacity, and the Lords spiritual and temporal, who sit together in the one chamber. The spiritual Lords consist of two archbishops and twenty-four bishops. They represent the connection between the Protestant Episcopal Church of England and the State. The Lords temporal consist of all the peers of England. They sit either by hereditary right or by creation of the Sovereign. They also consist of those Irish peers elected for life, and of Scottish peers elected for the duration of Parliament.

In establishing a Federal Parliament for the British Empire, the Upper House of such a body would necessarily have to be made a Senate, not a House of Lords, or at least not as that body now exists. In forming a Senate, however, one should keep in mind, as much as possible, the House of Lords, and not digress from the British Constitution in that respect more than is absolutely necessary. The more democratic ideas of our kin in Greater Britain would scarcely admit of the creation of an hereditary body like the House of Lords as a part of a Federal Parliament, and it seems now only a question of time when the House of Lords will

be reformed and strengthened. A seat in this legislative body will then probably be made appointive or elective, instead of, as now, for the most part hereditary. Such arguments are certainly based on much sound common-sense.

The Senate here proposed should really be a House of Lords in many respects, but instead of being for the most part an hereditary body, it should be composed of a limited number of members appointed by the Crown for life. A peerage, within the discretion of the Sovereign, could, when considered advisable, be given in addition to a Writ of Summons to the Senate. It would be in the nature of a compromise between the form existent in the House of Lords and the Senate of the United States or Australia to have Imperial senators appointed by the Crown for life, or for a specified term of years. This would follow the method adopted by the British North American Act, for in pursuance of that Act the Senate of Canada is composed of senators summoned by the Governor-General, on behalf of the Crown, for life. In the United States the senators are elected by their several State legislatures; this practice has entailed considerable corruption in the elections, and makes it well-nigh impossible for any but the very wealthy ever to hope of being elected. The truth of this is demonstrated when the Senate of the United States is alluded to as the "Millionaires' Club." In Australia the senators are elected by the people of each State as a whole, the only difference being that the members of the Lower House are representatives of districts. This is apt to make the Upper House too popular, being contrary to the object for which it was created. It would seem from this that the members of the Senate of the British Empire should be called by a Writ of Summons from the Sovereign for life, or for a specified term of years.

In looking at a map of the British Empire, and at a table of statistics of population, trade, and wealth, it is perplexing to notice the great differences in the population, trade, and commerce of the several States which

would form the Federation. It may seem hard to devise a fair scheme of apportioning members from the several States to the Senate. A somewhat parallel example presents itself in the Federation of the United States of America in its infancy. There, also, the States differed greatly in population and trade. The Constitution of the United States provides by Art. 1, s. 3 : " The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two senators from each State, chosen by the legislature thereof, for six years ; and each senator shall have one vote." In our case, the several States would differ more greatly than the States of the American Union. For example, in the case of the smaller communities, like New Zealand and Newfoundland, it would seem hard that they should have a number of senators equal to Australia, Canada, or Great Britain, each with their several millions of people. Several methods of apportioning the number of senators might be suggested ; first, by giving the United Kingdom, Canada, Australia, and South Africa an equal number each ; and the smaller communities, like New Zealand and Newfoundland, two each, thus making the distribution as equal as possible, excepting with the last two communities, which at present are so far behind in population. An alternative would be to adopt a sliding scale and apportion a certain number from each State on a basis of trade, wealth, and individual importance ; that is to say, in some proportion to its obligations to the Empire and to the Imperial Exchequer. This would seem to be the fairest and most politic method to pursue.

It appears only equitable that the State which contributed to the defence and general expense of the British Empire should have a greater number in Parliament to direct such expenditure than the State whose contribution to the welfare of the whole was of smaller magnitude. The Upper House would then be put on a basis of contribution.

The United Kingdom would be represented in that body by some of her greatest men, both peers and commoners, who had earned honour and distinction in her

local Parliament, and the oversea States likewise would be represented by their greatest statesmen. The Senate would then be composed of both peers and commoners, and a peerage would be within the gift of the Sovereign to bestow on a particular senator, who would enter the Senate after a distinguished career in the cause of Empire as a reward and recognition of his services. This would then, in many respects, make the Imperial Senate practically a House of Lords. But under this plan this would not absolutely be the case, since many of the senators might be peers, either by creation or inheritance; it is not to be assumed that every senator should, as a matter of course, be created a peer in addition to his Writ of Summons to the Senate. If this should be so, then it would be a House of Lords absolutely. Whether the Upper Chamber of the Imperial Parliament be called the House of Lords, or the Senate, will make little difference if it is constructed on the lines as here advocated. It would thus become a most effective legislative body, suited to the conditions of this twentieth century.

The members of the Senate, as above stated, could either be appointed by the Crown for life, or for a term of years, and should, like the members of the House of Commons, receive a salary. This could be augmented in the same way as the members of Parliament from the more distant States. It would also be advisable to provide senators transportation in the same manner as provided for members of the Lower House. Senators should, whenever possible, be men of independent means, apart from their salaries, thus obtaining men of position in that assembly and removing the evil of possible corruption from such a body, often a great temptation to a man of narrow circumstances.

This Imperial Parliament would be the supreme head of all the legislative power in the Empire. Yet, as is the case with the present Imperial Parliament, it would not be called upon to exercise its powers on any but matters of Imperial import. Its direct powers, therefore, should be reserved by a well-defined range of

subjects, while the other powers of government would be delegated to the State parliaments throughout the federation. Chief among the subjects which should come under the direct jurisdiction of the supreme legislature are the following :—The status and dignity of the Crown ; the declaring of war and the conclusion of peace ; legislation as to prizes ; offences against international law and against treaties with foreign powers, and also all offences committed on the high seas ; in addition, legislation as to treaties, and diplomatic and commercial relations with foreign nations ; legislation regarding the naval and military forces of the Empire, also the diplomatic, foreign and consular services ; legislation as to the establishment of a supreme court, admiralty courts, etc. ; legislation as to treason, alienage and naturalisation ; legislation as to interstate relations with various parts of the Empire, which would include the making of amendments to constitutional acts on request ; also the regulating and transferring of people from over-populated to sparsely settled districts ; legislation as to currency, coinage, legal tender, weights and measures, copyrights, and patent laws ; commerce—foreign and interstate ; postal, telegraphic and transportation affairs ; finance and revenue.

Many may argue against this scheme of a federal legislature as being impracticable, for the reasons that the several States are separated from one another by enormous distances, both by sea and land. But one may point, as an example, to the construction of the United States of America, the greatest existing federation, entered upon a little more than a hundred years ago by the several Colonies of North America, with territory extending over a huge portion of the American continent. Mr. James Bryce, in his learned work, "The American Commonwealth," describes the framing of the Constitution as "a work which seemed repeatedly on the point of breaking down, so great were the difficulties encountered from the divergent sentiments and interests of the different parts of the country, as well as of the larger and smaller States. He also says : "The

Convention had not only to create *de novo*, on the most slender basis of pre-existing institutions, a rational government for a widely scattered people, but they had in doing so to respect the fears and jealousies and apparently irreconcilable interests of thirteen separate commonwealths, to all of whose governments it was necessary to leave a sphere of action wide enough to satisfy a deep-rooted sentiment, yet not so wide as to imperil national unity."

The Constitution of the United States was framed long prior to the days of railways, telegraphs, good roads, and other conveniences of present-day civilisation. It was formed in the days of the stage-coach, of the highwayman, of bad roads, and of almost trackless forests, which made communication and travel precarious and most expensive. The members of Congress from the more remote States had to overcome all these difficulties and dangers. It took considerably longer to travel from Pittsburg to the national capital than it now does to cross the ocean, and travel was then attended by none of the present-day conveniences. Travel for the members of the Imperial Parliament in a palatial Atlantic or Pacific liner of to-day would differ vastly from the manner in which members of the American Congress once journeyed to the national capital, by stage-coach and pack-horses, over the mountains, through blinding snowstorms, great forests, and through miles of open but unsettled country.

So long ago as the early 'seventies Mr. W. E. Forster, in an article to the *Westminster Review* on our Colonial Empire, thus wrote: "As to the geographical argument, it is each year becoming more obsolete; we laugh at distance! Australia is not so far off now as John o'Groats was a century ago. Swift steamers and ocean cables make Melbourne as near to us as Dublin. It is too late, when we can transmit men by steam and messages by electricity, to urge that distance is a bar to government." And this was said in 1876. Has not the Empire greatly progressed since then? The trip to Australia has been shortened, and will be shortened

again before long. Canada is less than six days from us, and there are those who maintain that a service could be instituted making the trip between Liverpool and Sydney in four days. As Mr. Chamberlain has also said: "We have got rid of the provincial idea that the sea is an impassable barrier to union. We see it now as the highway which connects us. The distance between, let us say, on the one hand the Hudson Bay territory, and on the other hand the Yukon, is greater than that between this country and Canada. It would not take much longer now to go to Australia than it took our ancestors, some hundred or hundred and fifty years ago, to go from Land's End to John o'Groats. All is changing. Invention is moving the world, and now there is no physical difference, no physical difficulty, which prevents the federation of the British race." In addition to this there is now a purely all-British cable connecting the great communities of the Empire, and we herald the new invention of wireless telegraphy.

Mr. Ferdinand E. Kappey, in a most instructive article on "Cable and Colonial Telegraphs" to be found in Volume V. of the British Empire Series, gives the time consumed in sending cable messages of congratulation on the occasion of the commemoration of the proceedings at the Imperial Institute. The following show the dispatch which several met with:—

Prince of Wales to:—	Time sent.	Time received.	Time occupied.
Viceroy of India ...	11.46 P.M.	11.58 P.M.	12 minutes.
Governor of N. S. Wales	11.48 P.M.	12.17 A.M.	29 "
Governor of S. Australia	"	12.15 "	27 "
Governor of Victoria ...	"	12.19 "	31 "
Governor of Tasmania ...	"	12.10 "	22 "
Governor of N. Zealand	"	12.14 "	26 "
Governor of Queensland	"	12.9 "	21 "
Governor of W. Australia	"	12.12 "	24 "
Governor of Natal ...	11.51 P.M.	11.57 P.M.	6 "
High Commissioner, Cape	11.50 P.M.	12.11 A.M.	21 "
Gov.-General, Canada ...	12.25 A.M.	12.33 "	8 "

“It will, of course, be understood,” says Mr. F. E. Kappey, “that the lines were cleared to achieve these extraordinary results, but they represent little less than the normal time required to communicate in the ordinary way. Contrasting the times occupied in the transit of the traffic when the lines were first opened with that of the present day, we find astounding differences. Five hours was formerly the average time for a cablegram to reach India; to-day it is thirty-five minutes. Australia was communicated with in ten hours; to-day a little over one-and-a-half hours is considered the normal. It is, therefore, no idle phrase when we speak of the practical annihilation of time and space, and nothing, perhaps, has done so much to bring about the union of hearts throughout the scattered dominions of this our mighty Empire, than those girdles of steel which compass the ends of the earth.”

The *Manchester Courier* in its edition 8th August, 1904, said: “In an Empire of this magnitude, and in days when the longest voyage is only a matter of a few weeks, there is no reason why a Colonial Conference should not be an annual event.” If this be so, then an annual session of an Imperial Federal Parliament is practicable. Parliament could meet in February or March, and would probably be quite ready for prorogation by the month of July. This would then enable the members to spend the greater part of the year at their homes, where they would be in active contact with their constituencies, thus doing away with the possibility of getting out of touch and sympathy with their people. The debates on the great questions of the Empire could, for the most part, be read by the constituents in their local papers the following day in Montreal, Melbourne, and Cape Town, being transmitted by cable, or possibly wireless telegraphy by the great press associations.

An objection which may be raised is that the interests of the several States would clash and thereby make impossible a community of interest. But this is also met by the first objection—that of the peculiar geographical

conditions existent in the Empire. It is because the United Kingdom, the Dominion of Canada, Australia, and South Africa are separated by sea and are situated in different quarters of the world that their interests are far less likely to clash than if they were contiguous like the States of the American Union. It is easy, therefore, on this account, properly to define the questions of a local nature which are dealt with by local legislation and those questions which can be dealt with by the larger jurisdiction of a federal government. But in spite of this fact of geographical separation, which in this way is a boon, yet this very separation demands, in turn, united action in order to deal efficiently with the vast interests common to these several units.

But there are those who insist that the several parts of the Empire have no great community of interest, and that the interests of the Dominions are in fact so diverse and the physical conditions of each differ so radically that any community of interest necessary for the proper working of an Imperial Federal Parliament would be impossible. But this must, and should, be successfully challenged, for in spite of these alleged differences, a community of interest does now exist, even though these interests through lack of a central organisation cannot be practically utilised. Mr. Freeman once said : " Canada and Australia care much for England, but I doubt very much if either of them care much for each other." And the late Mr. Goldwin Smith in an article entitled " Straining the Silken Thread " in *Macmillan's Magazine* of August 1888, said : " What interests of the class with which a Federal Parliament would deal have Australia and Canada in common? What enemy has either of them whom the other would be inclined to fight? Australia, it seems, looks forward to a struggle with the Chinese for ascendancy in that quarter of the globe. Canada cares no more about a struggle between the Australians and the Chinese for ascendancy at the other extremity of the globe than the Australians would care about a dispute between Canada and her neighbour in the United States respecting Canadian Boundaries or

the Fisheries Question." But Mr. Freeman and Mr. Goldwin Smith and other critics have either overlooked or are ignorant of the great commercial community of interests which now bind the Empire, a tie which, after all has been said, is the most powerful and lasting, inasmuch as it is selfish and practical, and one which our foremost statesmen are now striving to make more binding. The annual commerce afloat of the Empire amounts to over £1,200,000,000, a very large part of which is inter-Imperial trade—trade between Australia and Great Britain, Great Britain and Canada, and between Canada and Australia, and also South Africa. A line of steamers now runs between Montreal and Cape Town, and between Canada and New Zealand, and owing to the British preference tariff in the two countries trade is being greatly stimulated between them. The Canadian Pacific Railway maintains a service between Canada and Australia, as well as the Far East, and by a proper system of Imperial preferential tariffs trade between Australia and Canada could be greatly stimulated.

It is well to consider what Mr. Goldwin Smith wrote, because he is regarded as a great authority by the opponents of Imperial Unity: "What interests of the class with which a Federal Parliament would deal have Australia and Canada in common?" The answer is, great interests, a few of which may be briefly considered. In the first place, there would be the common desire of all for the maintenance, integrity, and general advancement of the British Empire, and any and all questions bearing on this great desire would be to the interest of all. For even to-day the doctrinaires of separation and others are forced to admit that throughout the self-governing daughter-States there is a strong desire manifested to maintain "British connection," and of late years this feeling has been intensified.

Secondly, as heretofore pointed out, there would be the great commercial community of interest, perhaps the most powerful of all. One of the chief occupations of a Federal Parliament, therefore, would be to foster

and increase the great inter-Imperial or inter-State commerce of the Britannic States, thus promoting the national wealth.

Thirdly, there would be the great community of interest to be gained by promoting an efficient means of national defence, and also of the Empire's relations with foreign powers, which will be fully considered in a subsequent chapter.

A Federal Parliament would deal with anything tending to draw all parts nearer together, such as the control of ocean cables, and the protection and improvement of the present Imperial British cables connecting most of his Majesty's dominions. Inventions like wireless telegraphy should be under the control of the Imperial Government; and any legislation concerning such matters would be of interest to every State. The improvement and cheapening of the Imperial postal service, and all legislation regarding the Empire's merchant marine for its protection and improvement, as well as subsidies to the various steamship lines for improved service between all parts of the Empire, would undoubtedly be of common interest to all. So also would be any legislation endeavouring to give a mutual protection to patents and copyrights. Should the Federal Government carry out a great scheme for assisting population in emigrating from congested districts to those communities where an increase of population was greatly needed, that would also concern and interest all. These are but a few of the great questions with which the Federal Parliament would be called upon to deal, questions which would be of common interest to everyone.

Mr. Goldwin Smith further added: "What enemy has either of them whom the other would be inclined to fight?" These words, written in '88, seem strange reading to us now. The experience of the campaigns in Egypt, South Africa, and China have proved the groundless supposition of these words. We are realising more and more every year that when a part of this great Empire is attacked and goes to war, that our

adversary is not only in a technical sense at war with the British Empire, but in a very actual sense. Mr. Goldwin Smith, in endeavouring to support his views, asked what Canada and Australia may each have to face in the future, and asserts that they both are and will be mutually indifferent as to results in each case. He says as already quoted: "Canada cares no more about a struggle between the Australians and Chinese for ascendancy at the other extremity of the globe than the Australians would care about a dispute between Canada and her neighbour in the United States respecting Canadian Boundaries or the Fisheries Question." This certainly, even in 1888, would seem to be a very radical and broad statement, but as to whether these views have proved correct, the events of the South African War will conclusively show. Mr. John Morley, now Lord Morley, also speaking some years ago in a similar strain and endeavouring to give an example aiming at the impossible, said: "As well might one believe that New Zealand would spend her blood and treasure to uphold British supremacy in South Africa."

But Canada in more ways than one would be greatly concerned in a struggle between Australia and the Chinese for ascendancy, and much more than she was in the struggle between the Dutch and British in South Africa. Canada with her Pacific seaboard is in fact becoming more concerned in the Far East every year and cannot remain indifferent to the position, now and in the future, to be occupied by Russia, Japan and China. The developments from the Russo-Japanese War bear with increased significance upon the geographical position of Canada. Her ports on the Pacific are only ten days away from those of Japan. She is almost as near to Asia as to Europe. She is, therefore, vitally interested in the maintenance of British prestige, and in our continuing to occupy a premier position in that part of the globe. Australia is in the same way also vitally interested. The rise of Japan to the position of a great power is of great interest to the British

Empire as a whole, though more especially to Canada and Australasia. Canada maintains the exclusive acts against the Asiatics in the same way as Australia, and no one can tell what the future may bring with an organised China under Japanese leadership. That the British people in Canada will not be interested and send aid to their kin in Australia if engaged in a great struggle with an Asiatic power is absolutely absurd and contrary to all reason and precedent. Their patriotism, not to speak of self-interest, would force them to send aid. No one in Canada could view with equanimity the subjection of a great British dominion inhabited by several millions of their own people. The thing is preposterous. The fearful loss of prestige to the British Empire and the great corresponding gain to the Asiatic conqueror could not be risked for an instant. It would be to the interest of Canada, apart from her patriotism, to help maintain the British Empire, as much, if not more so in Australia, as she so nobly did on the battlefields of South Africa. The welfare of the unit is the welfare of the whole, and an injury suffered by one part is reverberated throughout the entire system, anything said by that great critic, Mr. Goldwin Smith, and others to the contrary notwithstanding.

Another most important factor of advantage in forming a system for Imperial unity is that we are not faced by a problem which confronted our American kin, when they entered into nationhood, that is, the creation of an executive head, who should, if possible, be free from the evils of party politics. After centuries of dissension, the final result of which is the British Constitution, a form of government has been attained with an executive head, which is to-day the admiration of the thinking world, and is acknowledged by many thoughtful minds in the Great Republic as the truest form of government existent. The Sovereign rules, but does not govern, and His Majesty is following in the footsteps of his most illustrious father by commanding the respect and love of all his people in the Empire's several parts.

But, again, those who are opposed to Imperial unity will probably argue from the fact that in the scheme of representation suggested in this chapter the United Kingdom would have a greater representation than the rest of the Federation combined. But they might be informed that the population of the Empire is not stationary but is growing yearly. It is also to be hoped that a reasonable confidence in one another's spirit of fair play would be shown. No portion of the Empire would be interested in thwarting or injuring another, whereas under present conditions the danger is that the Imperial authorities may sometimes ignore or injure Colonial interests through their ignorance of the same. What should be realised, therefore, is the fact of representation—not merely the extent of the same. The Colonies of France are represented in the Chamber of Deputies by ten members out of five hundred and eighty-four; in the Senate by four members out of three hundred. In fact, our present disproportion of numbers is not nearly so great as that between the several States forming the German Empire. The Kingdom of Prussia has a membership in the Reichstag of some two hundred and thirty-six, while the Grand Duchy of Saxe-Weimar has but three.

Beside it must not be assumed that the interests of all the Dominions on one side will conflict with those of the United Kingdom on the other, and that the forces in Parliament will be so arrayed. Should this be the case Federation would be impossible. What is more than probable is that parties will form in this Imperial Legislature; possibly one in favour of the doctrine of State rights, whereby the States will be individually powerful; while the other party will be in favour of centralisation—of the doctrine that the States collectively shall be deemed all-powerful and not separately. The representatives of the different States will belong to both these parties in such a way that it is improbable that all the representatives of whole States will be in one party and all of another section in the other. It is to be assumed that they will be divided up in their

party politics in the same manner as the Legislatures of great countries are at present.

Furthermore, as Mr. T. A. Brassey wrote : * “ The population of Canada exceeds that of Scotland, the population of Australia is roughly equal to that of Ireland, while the white population of South Africa will ere long not be incomparable to that of Wales. This means that in a properly constituted Imperial Parliament, Canada, Australia and South Africa would carry as much weight as Scotland, Ireland or Wales, and the control which they would be able to exercise on Imperial policy would not be inconsiderable.”

After every census, if the increase so warranted it, the proportion of representation could be readjusted.

It should be borne in mind that the Dominions of to-day are annually growing in population and will undoubtedly in a few years become nearly equal to that of the United Kingdom and eventually surpass it. And Imperial Unity, if it ever comes about, will not be possible for some years. Great doctrines such as this are not constructed or realised in a brief period. The great Roman roads were not built in a day. So with Federation, the idea must grow and steadily gain a hold on the affections of the British people the world over. The many newer communities in the Empire are hardly ripe for it, their time and energy being occupied often with absorbing problems of a local nature. Yet it would be unwise to be blind to the fact that the unexpected sometimes happens. “ Necessity knows no law,” nor cares for causes or conditions. It was the necessity of national existence or salvation which drove the American Colonies into a Federation. Mayhap a like necessity may soon be faced by the British people in a struggle against a great combination. To-day there are forces at work in the several parts of the Empire which may hasten Federation.

Sir Henry Parkes once, speaking against Australia

* “ Federal Government for the United Kingdom and the Empire.”
—*Nineteenth Century*, November, 1901.

severing herself from the Empire, defined the only alternative to be a "sharing on equal terms in all the glory of the Empire." This it is seen when analysed does not advocate an equal share to begin with, but a "sharing on equal terms," which is understood to be that the power exercised by each member should bear some proportion to its importance in the Empire. Great Britain then, so long as she would bear the greatest share of the obligations of the Empire such as defence, should undoubtedly, while so doing, have the larger share in the councils of the Empire.

Professor Seeley in his admirable book "The Expansion of England," wrote: "In not more than half a century the overwhelming population of Englishmen beyond the seas, supposing the Empire to hold together, will be equal in number to the Englishmen at home, and the total will be much more than a hundred millions."

Though many may consider that too great a number in so short a time, yet it is known that the population in the Dominions is now increasing at a much more rapid rate than formerly. Especially is this so in Canada. So that when complete Federation arrives the population in the Motherland and her daughter-States will likely be in a different ratio from that of the present day.

CHAPTER III.

THE IMPERIAL PRIVY COUNCIL AND CABINET.

THE executive government of the United Kingdom, and, therefore, of the rest of the British Dominions is vested nominally in the Crown, but really in a Committee of Ministers, generally called the Cabinet. This has now greatly absorbed the functions of the old Privy Council. The Cabinet is, however, unknown to our laws, and is now virtually

constructed by Parliament, for its existence depends solely on the possession of a majority in the lower house of that body. In former times the status and importance of the Privy Council was somewhat different in its functions from those which it exercises to-day. According to Sir Edward Coke's description of that body, it was "a noble, honourable, and reverend assembly of the King, and such as he wills to be his Privy Council, in the King's Court or Palace." At one period it was regulated to the small number of twelve or thereabouts. Later it increased considerably until the reign of Charles II., when he limited it to thirty. Since then it has been augmented, and the number is now indefinite.

The principal duty of a Privy Councillor appears to have been "to advise the King according to the best of his cunning or discretion." The Privy Council of the United Kingdom to-day, although in some respects absorbed by the Cabinet, still retains its position in the Constitution, and is capable of expansion whenever occasion presents itself. From the Privy Council has been established the Judicial Committee, the Board of Trade, the Department of Education, and the Universities' Commission, and so forth, so that it is still actively a potential component of our Constitution.

To-day, with the British Empire united, but not federated, the British Cabinet is the Imperial Executive head of affairs. But in the event of Federation, the Cabinet of the United Kingdom would cease to be the Imperial Cabinet and would simply become the Cabinet of the United Kingdom, in like manner to the Cabinet of the Dominion of Canada. In such case, the Imperial Cabinet, constructed by the Federal Parliament of the British Empire, would absorb several portfolios from what would then become the local Cabinet of the United Kingdom, such as the Secretaries of State for Foreign Affairs, for War, for India, for the Colonies, and the First Lord of the Admiralty. The status of the present office of Secretary of State for the Colonies would be changed to that of Secretary of State for the Empire,

or Imperial Affairs, which office would also have a Department for the Colonies—those which would still be Colonies and, therefore, not in the Federation as States. This latter, however, could be changed to-day.

The Ministers, then, for the Imperial Cabinet, which would form His Majesty's Government for the British Empire, would be the Prime Minister for the Empire, the Secretaries of State for Foreign Affairs, for War, for Imperial and Colonial Affairs, for India, the Imperial Chancellor of the Exchequer, the First Lord of the Admiralty, and a President of the Imperial Board of Trade. This last office should be similar to the new portfolio created in the Cabinet of the United States and known as the Department of Commerce and Labour. It should supervise and keep in touch with the inter-Imperial and foreign trade of the Empire, and should also have under it a Department of Labour and Emigration. Of course, under Federation, the regular naval and military forces of the Empire would then come under Imperial control, as well as the diplomatic, foreign, and consular services. The Colonial Office would then become the Department of Imperial Affairs, in one sense of the word being the Department of Interior of the British Empire.

By this arrangement the Imperial Cabinet would consist of at least ten members, and there is no doubt that great benefit would be gained by creating the portfolio of Attorney-General for the Empire, with or without a seat in the Cabinet. It would seem necessary that His Majesty's Imperial Government should have such a legal adviser. Especially would this need be felt in the first few years of an Imperial Constitution; for, no doubt, questions would arise on the Constitutionality of many points, and as to the proper definition between State and Imperial rights and jurisdiction. The United States found this necessary in framing their Constitution, and questions involving State and Federal rights arise to-day. The able manner in which this branch of the American Executive Department has always administered its affairs and the aid which it

has lent to the proper execution of the laws of the land have amply demonstrated its efficiency and justified the wisdom of its establishment.

The Cabinet being open to all members of the Imperial Parliament would bring within the attainment of all members positions of the first rank in Imperial office. It would be an executive body truly Imperial, affording a field for the exercise of the greatest gifts of statesmanship.

CHAPTER IV.

THE STATUS OF THE UNITED KINGDOM UNDER FEDERATION.

NOW the greatest changes which would occur or would have occurred upon Federation would be in the status and government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland. Under present-day conditions the Government of the United Kingdom is the Imperial Government, and as such is supreme over all other governments in the British Empire. It has to-day absolute control of the foreign policy of the Empire, and the regular naval and military forces are also under its control, with the exception of the Indian Army, which latter is under the direct control of the Indian Government, and but indirectly under control of the Imperial Parliament. Therefore, the Colonies and Dependencies of Great Britain have to-day no share in determining the foreign policy of the Empire, nor do they take more than a minor share in the defence of the Empire. Of course, the British Cabinet necessarily regulates the foreign policy with a due regard for the interests of the Dominions, who in this way wield an indirect influence of no little weight. But as political entities they have no constitutional voice in determining such policy.

As has several times been stated in the preceding chapters, the United Kingdom would become just such a State in the Empire, as either Australia, Canada, or South Africa. The Government of the United Kingdom under such conditions would be local. Great Britain, although giving up, of necessity, her Imperial powers, would assume the leadership in such a union of States, and would, like Prussia, gain, instead of lose, in importance and prestige.

The question that is now briefly to be considered is the change in the status of the United Kingdom, from an Imperial Power to that of the leader in an Imperial union; also as to whether it would be more advisable for the United Kingdom to continue to have but one Legislature, or to be split up into three local political bodies, though keeping also the present Parliament for a Federal Legislature. In discussing this question one is apt to touch upon what some may consider dangerous ground. But it is not proposed or desired to have the "Home Rule" such as many have for years been agitating for Ireland; simply the establishment of some legislative Chamber each for England, Ireland and Scotland, for the purpose of relieving Parliament from some of the smaller local affairs, which to-day often crowd out more important business.

It is in the opinion of the majority that Home Rule only for Ireland is not practicable; but it is quite a different matter to adopt a certain amount of Home Rule for Ireland, Scotland, and England, taking up the policy of what is called "Home Rule all round." Mr. Gladstone's Irish Home Rule Bill of 1886 was fatally defective in that it in no way gave Ireland representation in the Imperial Parliament on questions concerning Imperial taxation. It was, in fact, a flagrant breach of our principle of "No taxation without representation." The second Home Rule Bill, brought up in 1893, endeavoured to remove this obstacle by giving Irish members the right to vote on Imperial questions, but to take no part in the local questions of England, Scotland, or Wales. But this was considered by the Commons to be

unworkable. The result was that in the state in which it was sent up to the Lords it allowed them to vote on all questions, either of an Imperial or of a local nature. This was fatal to the Bill, which was thrown out by the Lords. Two attempts then at local autonomy for Ireland have signally failed. The two alternatives are either to keep the present centralised Parliament, or to adopt the Federal system for the United Kingdom. The late Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, in a speech at Stirling Burghs, said :

“ The excessive burden of work now imposed upon Parliament can only be relieved by a large system of devolution. It is for this reason, as well as from a sense of right and justice to the nationalities concerned, that I regard as urgently necessary the creation for the three kingdoms of subordinate legislative assemblies dealing with the distinctive affairs of each.”

These local bodies, which could meet respectively in London, Edinburgh, and Dublin, need have but one Chamber, and their legislative powers should be limited. They should be unable to legislate on any important legislation, which should remain as now under the jurisdiction of the Parliament of the United Kingdom. This would be a fair compromise to Ireland in the matter of what a great portion of her people desire.

Some such scheme as this seems necessary to relieve Parliament of its ever-increasing burdens. Each session much important business remains unfinished owing to the enormous amount of legislation and lack of time with which Parliament is confronted. As was very aptly written by Mr. T. A. Brassey in an article to the *Nineteenth Century* for November 1901 entitled “ Federal Government for the United Kingdom and the Empire ” : “ That Irishmen and Englishmen should be supposed to legislate on the Scotch crofter question, of which they cannot have the necessary special knowledge, is absurd. That such a question, for instance, as the Disestablishment of the Church of England should be decided partly by the votes of Irish

Roman Catholics, Scotch Presbyterians, or Welsh Dissenters is totally opposed to the right of self-government, on which the Empire has been built up."

CHAPTER V.

AN IMPERIAL SUPREME COURT.

AMONG the changes that would be rendered necessary by a Federation of the Empire, even if not before, would be the establishment of a Supreme Court of Final Appeal for the British Empire, merging therein the functions of the two tribunals of to-day—the House of Lords and the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. For years a disposition has been growing in favour of one Supreme Court for the whole Empire. The present method of appealing to the House of Lords or the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, according to whether the appeal is from the inner or the outer Empire, is even to-day both inconvenient and antiquated. A change is, therefore, needed now, but upon Federation the alteration would become absolutely essential. The ideal to aim at is a true Council of the Sovereign, to which every subject, irrespective of race, creed, or colour, may appeal from the decisions of the many and varied courts of the Empire, and this conclusion has received the endorsement from time to time of many great minds.

As far back as 1872 Lord Hatherley, the Lord Chancellor, moved a resolution in the House of Lords setting out "that it is expedient that one Imperial Supreme Court of Appeal be established, which shall sit continuously for the hearing of all matters now heard by way of appeal before this House, or before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, and that the appellate jurisdiction of this House be transferred to such Supreme Court of Appeal." This Imperial Court was to consist of two divisions, "but the dividing line was not to be of such strictness that the judges in one

division cannot act in the other." In each division there were to be not more than five nor less than three judges, each receiving a salary of £6,000. Unfortunately this most progressive of policies did not get further than a reference to a Select Committee. In 1901 a conference was held to discuss the establishment of an Imperial Supreme Court, at which both India and the Colonies were represented by nominees. The result of the conference deliberations was that a majority of the members, consisting of five, signed an unqualified recommendation that appeals should continue to lie from the Dominions to His Majesty in Council, but suggesting that appointments to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council should be made from the Colonies, the appointments to be for life or a period of not less than fifteen years, and arrangements should be entered upon with a view to securing a larger attendance of Lords of Appeal at sittings of the Judicial Committee. At the Imperial Conference in 1907 the sentiment was favourable to the formation of an Imperial Court of Appeal. On behalf of Australia Mr. Deakin moved the resolution: "That it is desirable to establish an Imperial Court of Appeal." The matter was discussed at length by the different representatives, and the Conference generally favoured the adoption of the resolution, though some of the Premiers confined themselves to advocating a reform of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council.

Both under present-day conditions and under federation Lord Hatherley's scheme would undoubtedly prove more successful than even a partial reform of the Privy Council. In the first place the Privy Council is not the final court of the whole Empire. Its appellate jurisdiction, though of wide range, does not embrace the United Kingdom. This is due to the fact that centuries ago the House of Lords encroached upon the Constitution in regard to English appeals, and later with Scottish and Irish also upon the passing of the Acts of Union. Therefore, there is no absolute Judicial Council of the Sovereign. The Court of last

resort for the United Kingdom is the House of Lords. The Privy Council is also a survival of our Norman institutions ; a Supreme Court would be more in keeping with our Anglo-Saxon institutions and mode of government. But, probably, the greatest objection to be urged against it is that in this judicial council the dissenting opinions of its judges cannot be, and never are, published ; for it is an ancient principle that a Privy Councillor must take oath " to keep secret all matters committed and revealed to him, or that shall be treated, of secretly in Council." Furthermore, both tribunals being much the same, judges from the Privy Council are, more often than not, taken to make up the required number for the House of Lords, an arrangement which sometimes results in important Indian and Colonial appeals being presented before a depleted and, therefore, weakened tribunal. Some advance has been made by a Canadian, Australian, and South African judge sitting with the Council to assist in those appeals concerning his own particular State. But an ideal Imperial Supreme Court should consist of judges appointed by the Sovereign for life from India and the different States. It should be a court open to the most brilliant legal minds in the Empire, and as such it would necessarily become the goal of the ambitious in the whole legal profession.

A Supreme Court is necessary to the well-being of the Empire to-day, but when the Federation of the British Dominions is *un fait accompli* it will become absolutely essential. Such a court would have to be maintained to try constitutional questions if nothing else. For, if the problem is seriously considered, it would seem difficult, and, in fact, well-nigh impossible, to create an Imperial Federal Union without some clearly written instrument defining the rights and powers respectively of the Imperial and State Governments. It matters little whether we call such an instrument " The Constitution of the British Empire," or only " An Act for the Federation of the British Empire." The United States found such an

instrument necessary, as also did the German Empire. One can readily imagine the chaos that would have reigned supreme between the States and the National Government had the Constitution of the United States not been created. By the people of Greater Britain the force of this argument will be keenly appreciated; they are well acquainted with instruments of a similar nature. It would, therefore, be necessary to have a tribunal which would uphold and construe the Constitution or Act of Union.

An important question would arise as to whether this Imperial Court should be given the power to declare unconstitutional and annul Acts of Parliament. It certainly would be more in keeping with British principles were we to deny this power and to confine the jurisdiction of the judiciary to interpreting the laws laid down, leaving it to the Sovereign or Governor-General in Council, as the case might be, to disallow them. For it has always been admitted that Parliament has the absolute right of legislation in all matters. Yet it must be considered that, in the future, under Federation, with a written instrument, this might be both ill-advised and difficult. Especially would this be so in a question involving both State and Imperial rights.

The people of the United States found that in order to protect and uphold their Constitution jurisdiction had to be given to the Supreme Court to declare legislation that ran counter to the Constitution unconstitutional. The wisdom of this was fully realised in the first few years of union, when cases were continually arising concerning the Constitutionality of State and National rights and powers. No doubt in the infancy of Imperial Federation we should be confronted with like questions involving the rights and powers between the State and Imperial Governments. The Constitutionality of such could then be best determined by the King-in-Council—by a body such as would form our Imperial Supreme Court.

At the same time, even supposing this new principle to be established, the right of vetoing any Act passed

by any Parliament throughout the Empire should be continued in the Sovereign or his representative. This is essential for the safeguarding of Imperial interests and interests as a whole, as well as for the protection of minorities in the several States.

It has been suggested that the present right of appeal to the King-in-Council, through the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, should be abolished, and on the formation of the Supreme Court of the Dominion of Canada many persons urged that so far as Canada was concerned this should be so. This suggestion, however, did not materialise, the procedure being either by appeal to the Privy Council or to the Supreme Court; but a case once argued in the Supreme Court must depend on the permission of that Court to be carried further to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. Similar discussions and views have been held in Australia. But according to the Constitution it is held that "the Sovereign, as the fountain of justice, is constitutionally empowered to receive petitions and appeals from all his Colonies and possessions abroad, upon whatever regulations and conditions may be defined and imposed by the authority of the Crown-in-Council."*

It is to be hoped that this right of appeal may be maintained throughout the Empire, thus upholding one of our most ancient prerogatives granted by our Constitution. For although it may in some cases prove somewhat inconvenient, yet it affords an excellent lever on the judiciary in the Empire's many parts, a judge knowing full well beforehand that his decision is liable to be reviewed by this Court of last resort. A Supreme Court of the British Empire should not be postponed until Federation is realised, but should be established without delay. It would be well to revive Lord Hatherley's motion of 1872. For such a Court would be an important link in cementing the Empire. It would be the ambition of all judges to sit some day on

* Todd: "Parliamentary Government in the Colonies," second edition, p. 305.

this Imperial tribunal, which would have the largest jurisdiction of any court in the world, and would exceed in power and influence the greatest tribunal of the present day, the Supreme Court of the United States.

CHAPTER VI.

DRAFT BILL FOR A CONFEDERATION OF THE EMPIRE.

IT is primarily the purpose of these chapters to advocate the establishment of a Federal system for the Empire as the only possible mode of permanent Imperial Unity. That being the case, separate chapters are devoted to the various details, which, collectively, would be embraced in our Imperial polity. What must come if the British Empire is long to continue is an Imperial Constitution. The Federal system for the British people is to-day just as essential for their permanent union and protection as it proved to be for the American people as a Sovereign power after the recognition of their independence. But it was some time before public opinion in America could view with favour a Federal Constitution, and opposition to its attainment was firm and died hard. In like manner, while the greater part of our people at home and oversea are in favour of Imperial Unity, they differ as did the Americans as to the methods of securing that desirable result. Imperial Federation must, therefore, for the most part, be a policy of evolution rather than revolution. A Constitution for the Empire cannot be immediately achieved any more than the paper Constitutions of the political theorists of the French Revolution. If, then, Federation cannot be secured to-day, some plan of Confederation seems at least attainable. Such a scheme would, in the nature of things, be merely temporary, and, however admirable, would likely prove as inadequate as the Articles of Confederation for

America. But it is short-sighted policy to deny that these Articles nevertheless greatly paved the way to the establishment in 1789 of the American Constitution. It is, therefore, reasonable to suppose that a Confederation for the Empire to-day, a Staatenbund, would lead to a Federation, or Bundesstaat, to-morrow. In this chapter a formal plan for a Confederation is submitted, and a subsequent chapter will treat upon an Imperial Constitution, which might or might not result from this being adopted.

The following proposals are in the form of a draft Bill of the Imperial Parliament:

PREAMBLE.

Whereas, our Dominions, have, after centuries, duly expanded from the status of a Kingdom to that of a mighty Empire, embracing every quarter of the world, and whereas, these Dominions, which are peopled by our British nation, have long, whenever possible, been given full powers of local autonomy, in order to ensure and establish laws for their domestic tranquility. It is meet and proper, therefore, that for the more firm and closer union of our Dominions, as well as for the better protection, general advancement, and welfare of our peoples, this Act be ordained and established.

Be it enacted, therefore, by the King's Most Excellent Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Lords Spiritual and Temporal and Commons, in this present Parliament assembled, and by the authority of the same, that an Act for these Dominions be established to be known as the "British Empire Closer Union" Act to unite these States in a confederacy on the day of , which shall be in the year of our Lord, one thousand nine hundred and .

Article I.

The style of this Confederacy shall be "The British Empire."

Article II.

1. There shall be established an Imperial Council in and for the British Empire constituted in the manner, and having the powers and functions hereinafter provided.

2. The United Kingdom, and every Dominion, Commonwealth, and Colony (hereinafter described as "State") having representative Government under the Crown shall be entitled to enter this Confederacy.

3. No State shall be represented in the Imperial Council by less than two, nor more than seven members; and such members shall be chosen in each State by the electors of the more numerous branch of the Legislature thereof, in accordance with the provisions of electoral laws, prescribing the time, place, and methods of choice, and the qualification of membership, which may be passed by the Legislature of such State.

4. There shall be held an annual session of the Imperial Council convened by Royal proclamation, and the life of said Council shall be for a period of five years unless sooner dissolved by the Sovereign.

5. At the commencement of the session the Imperial Council shall elect a president and chairman of committees and appoint such other officials as may be requisitely necessary to the conduct of the proceedings.

6. In determining questions in the Imperial Council each State shall have one vote.

7. Freedom of speech and debate in the Imperial Council shall not be impeached or questioned in any court or place out of the Imperial Council, and the members of the Imperial Council shall be protected in their persons from arrests and imprisonments during the time of their going to and from, and attendance on the Imperial Council, except for treason, felony, or breach of the peace.

8. The powers and functions of the Imperial Council shall be to consider and recommend, with reference to such matters requiring uniform or reciprocal legislation, or uniform administrative action, as may be sub-

mitted to it by Royal message, and particularly with reference to :

- (a) Imperial defence.
- (b) Inter-Imperial trade and trade with foreign States.
- (c) Navigation and shipping.
- (d) Oversea mail service.
- (e) Emigration.
- (f) Copyrights and patents.
- (g) Naturalisation.
- (h) Corporations.
- (i) Weights and measures.
- (j) Coinage.
- (k) Postal affairs.

9. Any recommendations involving legislation shall be reduced to the form of a draft Bill ready to be submitted to the Legislature of any State.

10. No Bill or recommendation of the Imperial Council shall have the force of law in any State unless and until the Legislature thereof shall have ratified and adopted the same.

11. The Imperial Council shall make standing rules and orders regulating its own proceedings. Upon a division on any question raised in the Imperial Council the voting shall be by States, and the vote of each State shall be determined by the majority of its members.

12. The Legislature of each State shall make provision for the costs and expenses of its representation in the Imperial Council.

13. The costs and expenses of the sittings of the Imperial Council in the conduct of its business and the record and publication of its proceedings shall be chargeable to each State according to its population.

Article III.

1. No State, without the consent of the Sovereign and Imperial Council, shall enter into any treaty, confederation or alliance with another State, or with a foreign State.

2. No State shall engage in any war without the consent of the Sovereign and Imperial Council, unless such State be actually invaded.

Article IV.

1. All charges of war, and all other expenses that shall be incurred for the common defence or general welfare of the British Empire, shall be defrayed out of a common treasury, which shall be supplied by the several States in proportion to the white population and national wealth.

2. The taxes for paying that proportion shall be laid and levied by the authority and direction of the Legislatures of the several States within the time agreed upon by the Imperial Council.

Article V.

The articles of this Confederation shall be inviolably observed by every State, and the Union of the British Empire shall be perpetual; nor shall any alteration at any time hereafter be made in any of them, unless such alteration be agreed to by the Imperial Council and ratified by the Legislatures of a majority of the States.

CHAPTER VII.

DRAFT OF A WRITTEN CONSTITUTION FOR THE EMPIRE.

BURKE, in his great speech on American taxation, delivered in the House of Commons in April 1774, said: "Every Englishman ought not only to know the principles of the Constitution of his country, but also to know the principles of the Constitution of the British Empire, as distinguished from the Constitution of Britain." From this it is seen that the Constitution of the British Empire exists, but, like the Constitution of the United Kingdom, is unwritten. This one is an outgrowth of the English Constitution,

and has existed and developed ever since we became an Empire.

The British Constitution, therefore, has two capacities, like the British Parliament, which, according to Burke, "sits at the head of her extensive Empire in two capacities; one is the local Legislature of this island, providing for all things at home immediately, and by no other instrument than the executive power—the other, and, I think, her nobler capacity, is what I call her Imperial character, in which, as from the throne of heaven, she superintends all the several inferior legislatures, and guides and controls them all, without annihilating any."

In a similar way, from the two capacities of the British Constitution, we have the Constitution of the United Kingdom and the Constitution of the British Empire.

Upon the formal federation of the Empire its constitution, which is now unwritten, would of necessity have to be placed in more tangible shape—that is, it would have to be a written formal instrument, in like manner to the Confederation Act suggested in this book, as a preliminary to a more complete union.

It may, perhaps, prove of some interest to consider the following draft of a proposal for the written Constitution of the British Empire under a federal system, though such a procedure is, of course, purely academic. It will probably appear to some to be both unwise and presumptuous to attempt the idea—works of such a nature not being for an individual, but, more properly, for a committee or congress of men summoned for such purpose. Beside, it may be considered that any formal plan for such a Constitution is far too premature, and, therefore, of no practical benefit. But, unless ideas and proposals are advanced and discussed, the matter will not only be always premature, but will never materialise. It is only by the free and frequent exchange of ideas on the subject that the conditions can become widely known, and therefore criticism is to be desired. Even though such a Constitution is premature, and its

discussion purely academic, it will, far from working harm, on the contrary, it is hoped, prove of some benefit for us to endeavour to look into, devise and familiarise ourselves with an instrument which under a Federal system would of necessity have to be established. We would then, so to speak, be under two Constitutions: (1) The old British Constitution, the result of centuries of growth, made up of ancient precedents and time-honoured principles, and (2) the Federal Constitution of the Empire, the creation of time, circumstances and opportunities, defining the rights, powers and jurisdiction of the Imperial and State Governments.

The following draft of a Constitution for the British Empire therefore for the most part does not contain all the minor details which are a part of our present Constitution, but principally the matters which must form a part of an Imperial Constitution. This draft is undoubtedly far from perfect, though, being a proposal, and one purely academic at present, its shortcomings, which are realised by the author, are not considered vital. It is only the production of one mind, strengthened and aided by a study of our Constitution, and by the Constitutions of the United States, the German Empire, the Dominion of Canada, and the Commonwealth of Australia. Therefore, in the framing of a Constitution for the British Empire upon a Federal basis, such a Constitution would undoubtedly be drawn up by a committee formed of many minds, who would be recognised authorities on constitutional questions. It may be hoped that this draft will bring forth some criticism and discussion which, for the attainment of our Imperial ideal, is not only beneficent but essential.

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES OF THE BRITANNIC EMPIRE.

PREAMBLE :—Whereas our Dominions have after centuries duly expanded from the status of a Kingdom to that of a mighty Empire embracing every quarter

of the globe, and whereas the time has arrived for the closer and more perfect union of our Dominions, it is meet and proper therefore that, for the better protection, general advancement and welfare of our peoples unto posterity, this Constitution be ordained and established.

Be it enacted therefore by the King's Most Excellent Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Lords Spiritual and Temporal and Commons in this present Parliament of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland assembled, and by the authority of the same and by the advice and consent of the Senate and Commons of the Parliament of the Dominion of Canada; of the Senate and representatives of the Parliament of the Commonwealth of Australia; of the Senate and representatives of the Parliament of the Dominion of South Africa; of the Legislative Council and representatives of the Parliament of the Dominion of New Zealand; and of the Legislative Council and representatives of the Parliament of Newfoundland, that a Constitution for these Dominions be established, to be known as the Constitution of the United States of the Britannic Empire, to unite these States in a Federal Union on the first day of January which shall be in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and — and for ever after.

Article I.

SECTION I.—OF THE CHANGE IN THE STATUS OF THE IMPERIAL PARLIAMENT.

That the Imperial Parliament of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland shall hereafter divide its two capacities, Imperial and local, from one another, and, with the said two capacities, shall create itself into two distinct Parliaments, which shall be—(First) The Parliament of the British Empire, formed from its Imperial status, and having all of its rights, powers and jurisdictions, excepting those hereafter otherwise provided. (Second) The Parliament of the United

Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, formed from its local status, and having all of its rights, powers and jurisdictions, excepting as hereafter provided.

SECTION II.—OF THE PARLIAMENT OF THE
BRITISH EMPIRE.

That, for and in consideration of the foregoing, the supreme legislative power of the Empire shall be hereafter vested in a Federal Parliament, which shall consist of the Sovereign of these Realms, of an Upper House, styled the Senate, and of a Lower House, styled the House of Commons.

SECTION III.—OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

The House of Commons shall consist of all the people in the several States, who shall, however, delegate their powers to those elected by them to serve as members therein.

OF ELECTING MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT.

Each State shall prescribe the times and places of holding elections for members of the Imperial Parliament. But the mode of election must be uniform throughout the States : that of secret vote by ballot.

QUALIFICATIONS OF MEMBERS.

No person shall become a member of Parliament who shall not have attained to the age of twenty-one years, and been a British subject for ten years.

AS TO WHO MAY AND WHO MAY NOT BECOME
MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT.

Any peer who is not a peer of Parliament, or any peer of Parliament, who shall voluntarily resign his seat in the House of Lords of the United Kingdom, shall be eligible for membership to the Imperial House of Commons, and not otherwise. But, while serving as a member of that House, he shall be sued, indicted, proceeded against, and tried as a commoner for any offence with which he may be charged.

No member of the Imperial Senate shall have a seat in the House of Commons; and all contractors of the Imperial Government shall be disqualified either from voting or sitting as members, as well as all others suffering from civil disabilities recognised by the law.

APPORTIONMENT OF MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT.

Members of Parliament and direct taxes shall be apportioned among the States which are and at any time may comprise this Federation, in accordance to their respective numbers, which shall be determined by adding to the whole number of persons, subject, however, to modifications in those communities where there is included a coloured population which may not be in a state of mental and moral development to have the ordinary status of citizens. The actual enumeration shall be made within two years after the first meeting of Parliament, and within every subsequent decennial census the representatives of the several States shall be readjusted in such manner as may be directed by law. The number of members of Parliament shall not exceed one for every two hundred and fifty thousand, but each State shall have at least one member of Parliament. And until such enumeration and apportionment be made, the respective States shall select one member for every two hundred and fifty thousand persons, as based on the last census in said States, and each State shall select at least one member.

OF THE TERMS OF MEMBERS.

The House of Commons shall continue for a period of seven years, from the day of the return of the writs for choosing the House, unless sooner dissolved by the Sovereign.

VACANCIES.

On a vacancy occurring in the representation from any State, while Parliament is sitting, a writ for the election of a new member shall be issued upon motion in the House. Upon a vacancy occurring in the recess, a writ shall be issued by the Speaker.

VACANCIES IN THE SENATE.

Any vacancies occurring in the Senate by resignation, death, or otherwise shall be filled by the Sovereign issuing a writ of summons to a fit and qualified person.

OF THE OFFICIALS OF THE SENATE.

The Senate shall choose a President, *pro tempore*, in the absence of the Sovereign.

OF IMPEACHMENT.

The Senate shall have the sole power to try all impeachments, and, when sitting in that capacity, they shall be on oath of affirmation.

SECTION V.—OF THE MEETING OF PARLIAMENT.

Parliament shall assemble at least once in every year; and such meeting shall be in —, unless otherwise appointed by law. Every session must end with a prorogation, and all bills which have not been passed during the session shall be null and void.

MODE OF SUMMONING PARLIAMENT.

Parliament shall be summoned by the writ of the Sovereign, issued out of Chancery, by advice of the Privy Council, at least forty-five days previous to its assembling. The Sovereign is the head of Parliament; he alone shall summon Parliament, and no Parliament, save on the demise of a Sovereign, shall assemble of its own accord.

SECTION VI.—MODE OF DISSOLVING PARLIAMENT.

The dissolving of Parliament shall be its civil death. A dissolution shall only occur by the will of the Sovereign, or by proclamation during the recess of the same, or, finally, by the completion of its period of seven years.

SECTION VII.—POWERS OF EACH HOUSE.

Each House shall be judge of the elections, returns and qualifications of its members. A majority of each

House shall constitute a quorum to do business ; but a smaller number may adjourn from day to day, and may have the power to enforce the attendance of absent members, in a manner, and under penalties, such as may be determined by each House.

EXPULSION.

Each House shall provide rules of its proceedings, and punish members for unparliamentary conduct, and, on a vote of two-thirds, expel a member.

SECTION VIII.—COMPENSATION, PRIVILEGES, ETC., OF MEMBERS.

Both Senators and members of the House of Commons shall receive compensation for their services, the amount to be prescribed by law, and paid out of the Imperial Exchequer. In all cases, excepting treason, felony, and breach of the peace, they shall be privileged from arrest during their attendance when Parliament is in session, and in travelling to and from such session ; and for any speech or debate in Parliament they shall not be questioned elsewhere.

SECTION IX.—REVENUE BILLS.

All Bills for the purpose of raising revenue must originate in the House of Commons ; though the Senate may propose or concur with amendments, in the same manner as on other Bills.

ORDERS, VOTES, AND RESOLUTIONS.

All orders, resolutions, and votes passed by both Houses of Parliament shall be presented to the Crown for the royal assent, and the same cannot take effect until approved by the Crown.

SECTION X.—POWERS OF THE IMPERIAL PARLIAMENT.

It shall be lawful for the Sovereign, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and Commons of the Parliament of the British Empire, to have power and jurisdiction :

1. On the status and dignity of the Crown or Regency.
2. To impose and collect taxes, duties, and excises, as a means of Imperial revenue; to satisfy the debts and to undertake the common defence and general welfare of the British Empire.
3. To borrow money on the credit of the British Empire.
4. To supervise inter-Imperial commerce, and commerce with foreign countries.
5. To enter into treaties and relations with foreign Powers.
6. To make peace and declare war, to pass laws in regard to prizes.
7. To define and punish piracies and felonies committed on the high seas, and offences against the laws of nations, and against treaties with foreign powers.
8. To coin money and regulate its value, and that of foreign coins, and to fix uniformity for weights and measures.
9. To punish counterfeiting the securities and coin of the Realm.
10. To take over the post offices of the several States, and make them Imperial.
11. To establish a uniform system of patents and copyrights, or a system which will give mutual protection of the same.
12. To establish a Supreme Court of Final Appeal, and such other courts as may prove necessary.
13. To support an Imperial army and navy.
14. To provide for calling out and embodying the militia and other auxiliary forces of the several States, when necessary to the safety of the Empire.
15. To devise a system of aiding and transferring the population from the densely settled to the thinly settled communities of the Empire.
16. To acquire by purchase, or otherwise, ocean cables connecting the several States, in order to have them under the control of the Imperial Government.
17. To make any and all laws which may be rendered

necessary in order to carry out and execute the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Supreme Government of the British Empire.

SECTION XI.—OF THE POWER OF PARLIAMENT OVER THE ARMY.

No standing army in time of peace shall be maintained without the consent of Parliament, in accordance with the Bill of Rights of 1689. The number of troops and the cost thereof shall only be sanctioned by an annual vote of the House of Commons. Parliament shall exercise the right of passing an Act, called "The Army Annual Bill," at the commencement of each session, investing the Crown with powers to make regulations for the good government of the Army, and to frame the articles of war which form the Military Code.

SECTION XII.—OF LIMITATIONS OF THE POWER OF PARLIAMENT.

1. The privilege of the writ of habeas corpus shall not be suspended, excepting in the case of rebellion or invasion, when, for the preservation of the welfare of the people, it may be suspended during such period of disturbance.

2. No bill of attainder or *ex post facto* law shall be passed.

3. No money shall be drawn from the Treasury excepting for appropriations made by law; an account of all the receipts and expenditures of public money of the Empire shall be estimated annually, and included in the Budget, and shall be rendered to Parliament by the Imperial Chancellor of the Exchequer.

4. It shall not be lawful for the House of Commons to adopt, or pass by any vote, resolution, address, or Bill, for the appropriation of any part of the public revenue, or any tax or impost, to any purpose that has not been first recommended to that House by message of the Sovereign in the session in which such vote, resolution, address, or Bill is proposed.

SECTION XIII.—OF LIMITATIONS OF THE POWERS OF THE STATES.

1. It shall not be lawful for any State to enter into any treaty, political or otherwise, alliance or confederation. No State shall coin money, or make anything but gold and silver coin a legal tender in payment of debts, without consent of the Imperial Parliament.

2. No State shall pass any bill of attainder, *ex post facto* law, or any law impairing the obligation of legal contracts.

3. No State shall raise protective duties against the products of another, though duties for the purpose of revenue may be maintained with the consent of the Imperial Parliament. All duties on foreign imports shall be for the use of the Imperial Treasury, and the Customs shall be under the control of the Imperial Government, unless by law made otherwise.

4. No State shall, without the consent of the Imperial Parliament, maintain troops or ships of war in time of peace, or levy any duty of tonnage, enter into any agreement with another State or with a foreign State, or engage in war, excepting in case of invasion, or such great danger as will make prompt action essential.

5. No State shall elect, or in any wise appoint, its Governor, Governor-General, or President. All such appointments to be made, as heretofore, by the Crown.

6. No State shall endeavour to curtail, or do away with, the right of appeal to the Sovereign-in-Council, or to narrow the Royal prerogative by taking away the power of veto.

7. The Sovereignty of the British Empire shall be unimpeachable. No State shall, therefore, endeavour to withdraw from the Union.

Article II.

SECTION I.—OF THE EXECUTIVE POWER.

The Supreme Executive Power of the British Empire shall continue, as heretofore, vested in the Sovereign, to extend also to the heirs and successors of His Majesty,

Kings and Queens of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, of the British Dominions beyond the Seas, Emperors and Empresses of India. And His Majesty shall have the title of Emperor of this Federation, though keeping in addition the title of King of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland. And further, that the Imperial style and titles appertaining to the Imperial Crown of the United States of the Britannic Empire and its dependencies, and also the ensigns, armorial flags and banners thereof, shall be such as His Majesty, by his Imperial proclamation under the Great Seal of the British Empire, shall hereafter be pleased to appoint.

MAINTENANCE OF THE SOVEREIGN.

The Imperial Parliament shall at the commencement of each reign determine the grants of money towards the maintenance and dignity of the Imperial Crown of these Realms, which grants shall be voted annually. But such grants will be made to the Sovereign and Royal-Imperial family only so far as they are Sovereigns of the Empire, distinct from their status as Kings or Queens of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland.

SECTION II.—POWERS OF THE SOVEREIGN.

The powers and prerogatives of the Crown shall be deemed to be those exercised under the British Constitution, subject to the Parliament of the British Empire.

SECTION III.—OF HIS MAJESTY'S PRIVY COUNCIL.

There shall, as heretofore, be a Council to aid and advise the Sovereign in the government of the Empire, to be styled the Emperor's Privy Council for the British Empire, and the persons who are to be members of that Council shall be from time to time chosen and summoned by His Majesty, and sworn in as Privy Councillors. A Committee of Ministers, forming a

Cabinet, shall be His Majesty's Imperial Government, which Cabinet shall be derived from either House of the Imperial Parliament. And the existence of this body shall depend upon a majority in the House of Commons.

SECTION IV.—OF THE JUDICIARY.

The judicial power of the Empire shall be vested in a Supreme Court of Final Appeal, having appellate jurisdiction from all the inferior Courts in the Empire; and Parliament may from time to time establish such other inferior Courts as may prove necessary. The Judges of this Supreme Court, and such others as may be established, shall be appointed by the Crown, and hold their offices during good behaviour, and shall only be removable on addresses to the Sovereign from both Houses of Parliament praying for such removal.

SECTION V.—OF ORIGINAL AND APPELLATE JURISDICTION.

In cases affecting Ambassadors and other public Ministers, and those in which a State shall be a party, the Supreme Court shall have original jurisdiction. In all other cases the Supreme Court shall have appellate jurisdiction both in regard to law and fact, with such modifications and exceptions as Parliament shall make.

OF EXISTING LAWS IN THE SEVERAL STATES.

That the laws and courts of the several States shall remain as by law established, subject to the regulations of the Imperial Parliament from time to time, and as heretofore provided, that all writs of error and appeals from the Supreme Courts of the several States shall be decided by His Majesty's delegates in the Supreme Court of the British Empire, and that any existing laws or precedents contrary to these articles shall be hereby repealed.

OF TRIALS FOR CRIMES.

Trial by jury shall continue, as heretofore, for all crimes, excepting in cases of impeachment, and such

trial shall be held in the State where the said crime shall have been committed. If, however, such crime shall not have been committed within the territory of any State, Parliament shall by law direct where such trial shall take place.

SECTION VI.—OF TREASON.

Treason against His Majesty shall remain, as heretofore, subject to the future action of the Imperial Parliament, who shall have the power to define treason, and prescribe the punishment thereof; but conviction thereof shall not work forfeiture or corruption of blood for a period exceeding the life of the individual convicted.

SECTION VII.—ON THE PRESERVATION OF INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS AND LIBERTIES.

The rights, privileges, liberties and immunities of individuals, as defined and secured in the great principles of the existing British Constitution, shall be and are hereby incorporated and secured in this Constitution, excepting as herein expressly otherwise provided.

Article III.

SECTION I.—OF FUGITIVES FROM JUSTICE.

Any person charged with treason, felony, or other crimes in any State, who shall flee from justice from one part of His Majesty's Dominions to another, shall, if discovered, be delivered up, on a demand from the executive authorities of the locality from whence he fled, and removed to the place which has jurisdiction of the crime.

SECTION II.—OF THE EQUAL RIGHTS OF HIS MAJESTY'S SUBJECTS.

That His Majesty's subjects of each State shall receive all the privileges and immunities of His Majesty's subjects in the several States of this Federation. And His Majesty's subjects in the several States shall be on the same footing in respect of trade and navigation in all parts and places in the British Empire and its

dependencies, and in all treaties made by His Majesty with foreign Powers.

SECTION III.—OF THE ADMISSION OF NEW STATES.

It shall be lawful for the Sovereign, by and with the advice of His Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council, on addresses from the Houses of the Imperial Parliament, to admit the Colonies and dependencies, or any of them, into this Federation as States, on such terms and conditions, in each case, as are in the addresses expressed, and as the Sovereign and his advisers, as herein stated, think fit to approve.

Article IV.

SECTION I.—OF THE STATE DEBTS.

It shall be lawful for the Sovereign, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and Commons of the Parliament of the British Empire, to undertake the debts of the several States, or a per capita proportion of such debts.

SECTION II.—OF THE NATIONAL DEBT.

Parliament shall on meeting, without delay, proceed to apportion the National Debt of the United Kingdom among the several States. But such apportionment of the National Debt among the several States distinct from the United Kingdom, shall be only such portion of the National Debt incurred on behalf of the former colonies and dependencies, now States, in their foundation and protection in time of war from invasion and conquest, distinct, therefore, to that part of the National Debt which was incurred exclusively for the people of England, or of Great Britain, or of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland. Such part of the Debt remaining charged to the United Kingdom as its State Debt, unless, as heretofore provided, the Imperial Government undertake the debts of the several States, or such per capita proportion of the same as Parliament may hereafter provide.

*Article V.***SECTION I.—OF AMENDMENTS TO THE CONSTITUTION.**

An amendment must first be passed by an absolute majority in both Houses of Parliament. It shall then be submitted to the Parliaments of the several States. And this shall further be done in not less than two, nor more than nine months after the passage of the Bill for such amendment, through both Houses of the Imperial Parliament. Should an amendment be passed by an absolute majority of one House, and not be passed by the other, or passed with an amendment, as to which the two Houses disagree, and if, after an interval of three months, a similar disagreement occurs, the amendment shall be submitted to the Parliaments of the several States, in the same procedure as though it had secured an absolute majority in both Houses of Parliament. An amendment, in order to become law, must secure majorities in the Parliaments of a majority of the States, and finally receive the Imperial assent.

SECTION II.—OF THE SUPREME LAW OF THE LAND.

This Constitution, and the laws of the Empire which shall be made in pursuance thereof, and all treaties which are, or shall be, made under the authority of the Sovereign, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and Commons of the Parliament of the British Empire, shall be the supreme law of the land; and the judges in the several States shall be bound thereby, anything in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary, notwithstanding.

PART III.

CHAPTER I.

IMPERIAL DEFENCE—THE COMMAND OF THE SEA.

“**W**AR,” said De Tocqueville, “is an occurrence to which all nations are subject, democratic nations as well as others. Whatever taste they may have for peace, they must hold themselves in readiness to repel aggression.” In any study of Federation, Defence must be considered. It is a most essential detail in any scheme for British unity. Self-preservation is the first law of nature, and nations are as amenable to it as the individuals who compose them.

Let, then, the grand old Roman maxim, *Si vis pacem, para bellum*, be remembered. A state of preparedness for war is the surest guarantee of peace. To make our defeat most improbable, or to be encompassed only at a tremendous cost, would operate to incline our foes to refrain from a clash of arms so long as a peaceable solution of any incident might be possible.

It cannot be denied by those acquainted with the history of nations, that the wars of the past, and those which are yet to come, have been and will always be, according to the amount and importance, whether real or pretended, of the causes which institute or invite them. If this be an established truth, then it is important to consider whether the British Empire on a firm foundation would be as liable to be given as many just causes for war as if its foundation were insecure, or as if its component parts were not united. It would

seem beyond question that a firmly united British Empire would certainly give the fewest causes, for reasons which may be considered obvious. The deduction to be drawn, then, is that a Britannic Federation would most tend to preserve peace for the British people with the rest of the world.

One of the greatest reasons, therefore, to be urged for Imperial unity is the protection and power all would gain at the least possible cost in such a case. This is undoubtedly a community of interests such as before has seldom existed among so widely-scattered a people. Our common interests are so vast and closely interwoven that few appreciate them, even in a slight degree. Take, for instance, the extent of commerce of this great Oceanic Empire, a commerce afloat that is now annually worth about £1,200,000,000, and which is yearly increasing. It would seem that for the oversea Dominions, with their undeveloped resources, this is but the beginning of their commercial existence, and that to them the efficiency of the British Navy is of primary importance. Therefore the absolute necessity of the Navy continuing in the future, as in the past, to uphold the "Command of the Sea," should be manifest to all. In the first place, it is only by this means that it can control communications oversea. For without this "Command of the Sea" a country is unable to transport troops excepting under the most hazardous conditions. It is thus deterred from prosecuting successfully any large military campaign over sea, in which it might be engaged. The numerous examples of ancient and modern history both conclusively prove this to be so without a doubt. In B.C. 413, the Greeks made an expedition to Syracuse, but owing to the defeat of the Athenian fleet, the expedition was a failure, and their army was, owing to their severed lines of communications, forced to surrender. In 1783 Graves failed in his attack of Chesapeake Bay, and, as a result, the Imperial forces, under Cornwallis, were forced to surrender to the Colonial rebel forces, under Washington, at Yorktown. Again, the Battle of the Nile in

1798, was instrumental in making Napoleon give up his expedition to the East. It was, therefore, chiefly owing to our holding the "Command of the Sea" that the conquest of Canada by Wolfe in 1759 was made possible. And this is demonstrated in all our subsequent campaigns over sea up to the time of the war in South Africa in 1899 to 1902. Had we not been in a position to uphold the "Command of the Sea," it is greatly to be doubted whether we would have been permitted by the nations to transport an army of 250,000 men to Africa. Indeed, even as it was, one heard rumours of intervention by the Powers, vague though they may have been. The most recent example proving the correctness of this theory is derived from the campaign between Russia and Japan in 1904-5. It was only after Japan had gained the "Command of the Sea" from Russia, in the early stages of the war, that she was enabled to transport an army of several hundred thousand men to Korea and Manchuria. Prior to her obtaining this supremacy, her transports were menaced by Russian cruisers, several of which were sunk. Later her supremacy was again tested by reinforcements from Russia, under Admiral Rojestvensky, where it was fully decided in Japan's favour in the Battle of the Sea of Japan in 1905.

It was the theory of naval and military experts, in the earlier years of the last century, that the British Empire was too large for a proper scheme of defence, many of its parts being vulnerable. This theory, which to a certain extent was once true, has been shattered owing to the evolution of naval conditions, which, every few years, forces naval experts to consider new methods. Our former source of uneasiness—vulnerability—is now with the more perfect organisation an element in our favour.

The potential strength of our essentially Oceanic Empire may be realised when its many strategic positions are considered. In every sea we hold minor Gib-raltars; the Southern, or Cape route to the East, is well fortified; here are the stations of Cape Town, Sierre

Leone, St. Helena, and Mauritius. In spite of the Suez Canal, this route still remains one of our greatest trade lines. All along the principal route to the Far East, by way of the Mediterranean and Red Seas, there are heavily fortified stations, Gibraltar, Malta, Aden, Bombay, Calcutta, Trincomalee, Singapore, Hong Kong and Wei-Hai-Wei. All these are splendid naval bases. In Oceania there are also fortifications, at King George's Sound, Thursday Island, Melbourne, Sydney, Auckland, Hobart, Adelaide, Wellington, Dunedin and other places. Thence Eastward across the Pacific are more stations for the protection of British interests, Vancouver and Esquimalt, in the North Pacific. Crossing the American continent we have Halifax on the North Atlantic, and Southward, the Bermudas and St. Lucia, Jamaica and other stations in the West Indies. In the south-western Atlantic we hold the Falkland Islands. Finally, the opening of the Panama Canal will add considerably to the strategic value of Australia and the West Indies.

In 1905, for a combination of reasons, the Home Government reduced the naval and military forces in the West Indies to a minimum. The explanation was that concentration of the fleet is desirable as much as possible : concentration at the centre of the Empire, where the first blow in naval warfare would probably be struck, from which centre the squadrons would be distributed as necessity arose. This was also due to the increasing friendship with the United States, and to the belief that a war with that country is improbable. This was based then rather on policy than strategy. Canada's refusal at the time to contribute to the Navy probably also had something to do with the matter.

It must not, therefore, be assumed from this that naval bases are now considered obsolete. The late Sir Charles Dilke, an authority on Imperial Defence, showed this clearly when he said : " *The Times*, naval critics, and other high authorities, have so frequently drawn from the fate of Port Arthur the moral that fleets are lured to destruction by fortified naval bases that it ought, per-

haps, to be added to what has already been said of our American bases, that the Port Arthur argument may apply to a fortress such as Halifax, but does not affect bases such as those in the West Indies. Even as regards Halifax, a British fleet, with its fine traditions of never being caught by war in port, but of putting to sea whenever international relations become strained, would not be bird-limed by such a place as Halifax. The present war, so far from diminishing the importance attached to naval bases, has once more demonstrated their absolute necessity to fleets. We shall never be able to count on the benevolent neutrality of European Powers, and must either have our own coaling stations, or be in a position to seize and occupy temporary bases. Temporary bases far from home are, however, not always easy to find—witness our blockades of Brest and Toulon—and are always a drag to the fleet at the commencement of a war. Everything has to be conveyed and conveyed to them, and it may be asserted that the need for protected coaling stations is still as great as it was shown to be in a previous state of naval policy by the Carnarvon Commission. The argument of the British Admiralty that circumstances have changed through the greater radius of action of modern ships may affect some bases, such for example as Wei-Hai-Wei, but does not affect our West Indian stations when considered all together. These facts once more show that the grounds for the change made must be political rather than strategic.”

Surely, therefore, no other nation ever held such choice strategic positions. With this in view it should not be difficult to realise that the integrity of each member is essential to the integrity of the whole. Under such conditions, Canada, with her Pacific Coast, cannot afford to remain indifferent to the maintenance of British prestige in the Far East as against Russia, Japan, or other Powers. It is vital to the integrity of Australasia, also, that we permit no further European encroachments in Oceania, and, also, that we maintain a sort of Monroe Doctrine in the Persian Gulf. Thus it is seen that the

welfare of one is the concern of all, and that injury inflicted upon any part affects the entire system.

The old theory of vulnerability no longer holds, because of the many points of advantage held by us. The primary question with naval experts is "coal," while in the days of Nelson it was principally a question of food and ordnance. The battleship of to-day, unless able to renew her supplies of coal frequently, becomes worse than useless, while the old three-decker of yesterday, properly victualled, could, if necessary, keep at sea for months.

It is in this more than anything else that the British Empire has an advantage over foreign countries. No other nation has a chain of fortresses and naval bases extending round the world as we have, and accordingly our striking power is formidably increased and the "Command of the Sea," under proper conditions, assured.

CHAPTER II.

THE DOMINIONS AND NAVAL DEFENCE.

SINCE the meetings of the Imperial Conference, and that of the Imperial Defence Conference of 1909, when the question was mooted of the Oversea Dominions taking an equitable share in Imperial Defence, the idea has received a splendid impetus. Public opinion in the several States is practically unanimous in the Dominions assuming some of the obligations as well as the privileges of Empire. A great advance has been made—all now realise the necessity for the continued supremacy of the Navy, and all wish to do their part in helping to maintain that supremacy. They differ only in their ideas and means of so doing. But the mode of naval participation is all-important.

The year 1909 will become memorable in the annals of the Navy. In that year patriotic New

Zealand came forward with the offer to defray the cost of building one, and, if necessary, two first-class battleships. In this she was followed closely by Australia in also offering a Dreadnought or such addition to the naval strength as the Admiralty would indicate. To these proposals in years to come may be traced the foundation of a true Imperial Navy. The sentiment which prompted these gifts also animated the people in Canada and South Africa, and although the Governments in those Dominions did not follow New Zealand and Australia's steps, yet they assured the Imperial Government that the United Kingdom could count on their resources in case of need. The great fillip given to this movement was the increased activity in the ship-building programme of the German Navy.

Of late years the cost of armaments has increased enormously among the powers, and Great Britain, by virtue of her position, has been compelled to follow suit in order to uphold the integrity of the Empire. In 1909 the maintenance of the Imperial regular Army and Navy cost the taxpayer in the United Kingdom nearly sixty-four million pounds, and yet the Government was attacked on the ground that the sum voted was insufficient for the needs of the Empire. As Mr. Chamberlain aptly observed at the Imperial Conference in 1902, "The weary Titan groans beneath the orb of his too vast fate."

It should be realised by our people overseas that the cost of Imperial Defence borne by the United Kingdom involves an expenditure per head of the population of £1 9s. 3d., while in Canada defence has heretofore involved an expenditure of only 2s. per head of the population, about one-fifteenth of that incurred by the taxpayer in the United Kingdom. In Australia* it has been about 3s. 3d., in New Zealand* 3s. 4d., and in the Cape of Good Hope and Natal between 2s. and 3s. respectively.

* This is prior to Australia's and New Zealand's magnificent contribution of a Dreadnought each to the Navy, and of the increase of New Zealand's annual subsidy from £40,000 to £100,000.

The annual ocean commerce of the United Kingdom is, roughly speaking, about £850,000,000. In the last fifty years the trade of the United Kingdom has increased fivefold, while the trade of the Dominions and Dependencies has increased nearly ninefold. In the not far future the ocean commerce of the rest of the Empire will become equal and gradually outvalue that of the United Kingdom. A great share of the Colonial trade is trade in which the taxpayer of Great Britain and Ireland has no interest in either buying or selling. A great deal is intercolonial trade, or trade between the Colonies and foreign States. This vast and increasing independent trade has the same protection from the British Navy as the trade of the United Kingdom itself.

The United Kingdom for 1911-12 appropriated over £44,000,000 for the Navy. India with an expenditure of £74,000,000 and an annual commerce of nearly £170,000,000, contributes £100,000 to the support of the Navy. The Dominions, with an expenditure of £62,000,000 and an annual commerce of £234,000,000, contribute £384,000.* In other words, on a basis of population the United Kingdom expends 15s. 2d. per head; Australia, 10½d.; New Zealand,* 6½d.; Cape of Good Hope (white), 1s. 1¼d.; Natal (white), 4s. 5¾d.; and Canada nil. If, however, the expenditures were divided equally per head among the white population of the Empire, the charge per head would amount to 1s. 0¼d. It has also been estimated by the Royal Statistical Society that if an equal proportion of expenditure were contributed to the Navy, the share of the Colonies and India would amount to £20,000,000 a year; and if the contribution to the Navy were made in proportion to the trade which the Navy protects, the share of India and the Colonies would be £12,000,000 only.

Again, the united revenues of the Dominions exceed the revenues of the United Kingdom. The British tax-

* Prior to 1910.

payer at home has had, therefore, cast on him nearly the whole burden of protecting the interests which belong to his kin oversea equally with himself; he has had also to pay for the protection of interests which are not his own, but entirely those of his fellow-citizens in Greater Britain. This, to any impartial observer, seems a terrific inequality in the distribution of Imperial responsibilities and burdens. It is impossible that this can be permanent or even continue a great while longer. In the days when the Colonies were in their infancy, and were poor, and had no industries, they were not in a position to take a share in the defence of the Empire. And, what is more, in their unsettled state they offered but little attraction to the rapacity of the Powers. The rapid increase in material prosperity and wealth of the Dominions has, however, changed this, and in their present condition of expansion, they promise some day to rival in riches the United Kingdom.

But, as has been stated, the Oversea Dominions are now realising the necessity as well as the justice of taking their proportionate share in Imperial Defence. Some of them claim that they have already contributed greatly towards the same by establishing and providing for local defence.

Especially is this so in Canada. Canadians claim that by building the great transcontinental railways from ocean to ocean, which are in reality great "Imperial Highways," they have done more for defence than if they had contributed a sum direct to the Imperial Army and Navy. They also point to the expenditure of a large sum on their militia and in the establishment of a military college. The Canadian Government is also increasing the strength and efficiency of the militia, raising it on a war footing to 100,000 men. And in 1906 Canada took over the control of Halifax and Esquimalt.

While defence for local interests is always to be commended and encouraged, the fact remains that these contributions were indirect in their form, and are far from providing for an efficient national system

of organisation for the naval and military forces of the Empire.

Canada has a merchant marine fourth in importance among the nations, yet she contributes absolutely nothing towards the upkeep of the Imperial Navy upon which she relies for the protection of her merchant marine. Colonial merchants can sail and trade the world over, and are treated with respect, their lives and property being secure on account of their flag and the protection given them by the British Navy. If, however, anything does go wrong, then, in every principal port in the world, the Colonial merchant can at once seek the protection and advice of a British Consul, which officer is paid for exclusively by the taxpayer in the United Kingdom.

Aside, therefore, from the question of her commerce and the protection by the Navy of her people when abroad, it may be suggested that Canada's Pacific coast-line, in the event of a war with either Russia, Germany, or Japan, could be seriously ravaged by hostile squadrons, and much damage inflicted in the interior should a descent on her coasts be attempted. This action would not conquer Canada and proclaim the permanent sovereignty of an invader, because such a procedure would drag the United States into the conflict and array her forces on the British side. At the same time a temporary invasion of the interior would create fearful loss to the country. It must also be considered that Canada, as well as Australia, excludes the Chinese, though not the Japanese. Still, in view of a possible future alliance of an organised China and Japan, Canada, with her Pacific coast-line and her large and growing commerce, must be greatly interested in these possibilities.

It will also be admitted that the integrity and peace enjoyed by Canada is due to the integrity and supremacy of the Mother Country. It is, therefore, vital to the interests of Canada that the integrity and supremacy of the Mother Country continue. She is, therefore, interested in the supremacy of the British Navy, which

means the safety and integrity of the United Kingdom. Furthermore, in the event of a land invasion by the United States, the retention of the command of the sea by the British Navy is vital to Canada, in order that the British Empire may send reinforcements to aid her. Finally, if in the near future Canada becomes Britain's granary, then the transportation of food from Canada to the United Kingdom in time of war would, naturally, by no means be as secure as food from a neutral.

In spite of these foregoing considerations, Mr. Sifton and others in Canada have said that Canada, has no interest in the Navy, and, in fact, needed no naval protection.

In 1909, however, such views ceased to have any weight among any important section of the people. The Parliament of Canada passed a resolution in favour of the creation of a navy for Canada, acting in conjunction with the Imperial Navy. An important body of public opinion was against this and favoured a direct and substantial contribution to the Imperial Navy in ships and personnel.

Mr. Frank E. Hodgins, K.C., of the Toronto Bar, in an article entitled "Canada's Opportunity," in a Canadian magazine, said: "Sir Wilfrid Laurier, in discussing Canada's liability for the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, told his hearers at Sorel, P.Q., that it would only amount to \$14,000,000, and that, he said, was just one year's surplus. In this he was quite right, the Finance Minister of Canada having in his Budget speech in the House of Commons on the 7th of June, 1904, reported that he had a surplus for the year ending 30th June, 1903, of \$14,348,166.17, and that the average surplus for the eight years from 1896 to 1904 was \$7,238,011.49. It is therefore possible, and indeed easy, for Canada, merely out of her surplus revenue, to build, at a cost of \$5,000,000, one battleship a year. If she did so, then in eight years the great newly-formed Atlantic Squadron of eight battleships could be doubled. That fleet can reach the shores of Canada in six days.

But if her contribution were only one battleship every two years, the sum of \$2,500,000 a year would in the same period increase that squadron to the strength of the new Channel or Home Fleet of twelve battleships."

Since the Imperial Defence Conference the Canadian Government has decided upon the construction of a local or Canadian Navy, to be confined to local waters, which navy would be separate from the Imperial Navy. This has already been commenced.*

The force will start with four Bristols, one Boadicea, and six destroyers. The cost of the eleven ships will be £2,338,000 if built in the United Kingdom, or 33 per cent. more if constructed in Canada. There will be two naval stations—one at Halifax, on the Atlantic, and the other at Esquimalt, on the Pacific. There is to be a Director of Naval Service, who must be of the rank of rear-admiral or captain. The force will be under the Department of the Minister of Marine, and a Naval Board will advise the department. It is also provided that this force can be placed by the Government by Order-in-Council at the disposal of His Majesty for general service in the Imperial Navy or any part thereof. If such an Order is passed, then Parliament, if not sitting, shall be summoned to meet within fifteen days. There will also be established a naval college on the pattern of the Royal Military College at Kingston. The naval discipline will be in the form of the King's Regulations.

But these proposals seem inadequate both for Canada and the Empire. The experts of the Admiralty at the Defence Conference, when they found Canada and Australia obdurate in favour of maintaining local naval forces, then recommended that they each provide fleet units. But the foregoing cannot be called a proper

* It is now announced that representatives of the Borden Ministry will in July 1912 confer with the Admiralty as to the most suitable means by which Canada can co-operate with the Empire in its Naval Defence. It is to be hoped that the Laurier programme will then be abandoned and that Canada will share in an Imperial Navy under Admiralty control.

fleet unit. Moreover, by the speediest organisation, the Canadian Navy cannot be made really effective for at least fifteen years. It is for this reason that so many in Canada favoured the immediate contribution of battleships to the Imperial Navy to forestall a probable crisis within the next few years.

For some time there was considerable discussion in Australia in favour of the creation of a local navy. As to the wisdom of local navies for the several units of the Empire, a subsequent chapter will more fully determine. In 1902 both Sir John Forrest, then Minister of Defence for the Commonwealth, and Admiral Sir Lewis Beaumont, then commanding the Australian Station, strongly deprecated the idea. Since, however, the Imperial Defence Conference of 1909, the Government have decided upon the construction not so much of a local navy, as in the case of Canada, but of a fleet-unit of the Pacific Fleet, as recommended by the Admiralty. The Commonwealth Government have definitely decided, with some temporary assistance from Imperial funds, to provide an Australian unit of the Pacific Fleet. When this new scheme is in operation, that fleet will consist of three units—one in the China Seas, one in the East Indies, and the other in Australian waters. Each will comprise a large armoured cruiser of the "Indomitable" type, three second-class cruisers of the "Bristol" type, six destroyers of the "River" class, and three submarines of "C" class. The Australian unit, although under the Commonwealth, is a part of the Pacific Fleet, and, contrary to the case of Canada, its force will in time of war automatically pass under the undivided control of the Admiralty.

As regards New Zealand, she decided to continue to contribute unconditionally to the Imperial Navy. Her contribution will be applied towards the maintenance of the China unit of the Pacific Fleet, of which some of the smaller vessels will have New Zealand as their headquarters. The battleship, however, presented by New Zealand, which at first was arranged to be stationed in China waters, will now, owing to her patriotism, be

placed unconditionally at the service of the Admiralty and, therefore, will be assigned for duty in the North Sea.

In this connection the position of both Australia and New Zealand require each to be vitally concerned in the question of Imperial as distinguished from mere local defence, and it is to their credit that they are rapidly beginning to realise these truths.

In former times, before the great improvements in the use of steam, Australia enjoyed a certain amount of immunity from attack. But this is by no means any longer the case. The rise of Japan as a newly-armed and dominant Power in the Far East, the encroachments of Russia, the occupation of the Philippines by the United States, and of the remaining Samoan Islands by Germany, destroy this former isolation, and are facts ominous to Australian and New Zealand interests. The opening of the Panama Canal in the near future, the encroachments of Russia, and her increasing influence in Persia, point to the Indian Ocean, the North Pacific, and the China Sea as the theatre of the coming struggle. Then, too, the results of the Russo-Japanese war changed the balance of power in the Pacific. Some years ago the dominant Power in the Pacific was China. The rapid progress and modern development of Japan resulted in a war with China, from which struggle Japan emerged as the dominant Power. Owing to the intervention of the Powers, Japan was deprived of the fruits of her victory, and Port Arthur, an important naval base which she was entitled to by right of conquest, fell into the hands of Russia. The Imperial British Government saw in this acquisition by Russia a power which could, in case of a war, seriously disturb the British Empire, by an attempt to invade India, and seriously to menace the territory and commerce of Australasia and other British dominions. It was, no doubt, chiefly owing to these considerations that we entered into a defensive alliance with Japan, which has been generally considered a proceeding of good statesmanship. Now that Russia has been forced out of

Manchuria, Japan controls and preserves the integrity of Manchuria and Korea, with the assistance of China. The great result from Japan's war with Russia is that her power and prestige have been enormously enhanced. She has become recognised as a great World-Power. It is in this regard that a grave danger to the British Empire may arise. The trouble will be caused by the exclusion Acts in force in Australia and other Dominions against Asiatics. China has lately shown the United States, by the agitation on the part of her citizens, in boycotting American products, that she is far from satisfied with the exclusion Acts. This may be but the rumble before the storm.

Japan has consuls at the principal towns in Australia, and warships which make periodical visits to the ports, besides a regular line of merchant vessels trading between the two countries. Japan, therefore, regards these Acts with great dissatisfaction, and remembers the days when Chinese and Japanese ports were opened unwillingly under the moral suasion of cannon. So it is not in the least improbable that Japan will in the future take up vigorously the rights of her subjects, protesting against the exclusion Acts in Australia, backed up by China, whose forces will be organised under Japanese military and naval officers.

The Japanese Empire will feel that, having emerged victorious from a war with a European Power, she is entitled to the same rights and privileges as the other Great Powers, more especially as she is in alliance with the foremost of those Powers. She would appeal, therefore, to the Imperial British Government against such discrimination. Should the Parliament of Australia then refuse to repeal or, at least, to modify the exclusion Acts, the Home Government would be powerless to do anything. Our reply then would be that we had no control over legislation in the British Dominions, thus acknowledging the fact that the Empire is not much better than a disjointed and loose confederacy with little or no real central power.

This might involve the British Empire in a war with

Japan, who would be supported by China. These exclusion Acts are problems vital to Australia and the rest of the Empire, problems with which, sooner or later, we shall be confronted. The gravity of it is evident when it is seen that China, with her teeming millions, is situated near the great Australian island-continent, peopled by but four million souls. The unexpected sometimes happens. If in the future Russia, Japan, and China come together, an arrangement might be entered into whereby Japan and China would be given a free hand towards the invasion of Australia in turn for assistance given Russia to conquer India. We would be called upon not only to fight for the protection of India, but it would be a life-and-death struggle for Australia and the rest of the Empire. This latter eventuality is certainly less probable than the first; but it should be borne in mind that the isolation of Australasia is quite a thing of the past, and that she is now confronted, more or less, by all these foregoing considerations. The salvation of Australia can only be obtained by her future being indissolubly bound up with that of the Empire, thereby ultimately arriving at Imperial Federation. It will thus be seen how important the supremacy of the British Navy is to the integrity of Australia and New Zealand. A local navy for Australia, from these foregoing considerations, should not have been thought of.

South Africa similarly must rely for her protection on the supremacy of the Imperial Navy, and this fact she has acknowledged. She is confronted by France in Madagascar and Germany and Portugal as next-door neighbours. The Cape and Natal, prior to the federation of South Africa, arranged to grant a yearly subsidy of £50,000 and £35,000 respectively. Now that a federal union has come, we may expect a substantial contribution on the part of South Africa to the Imperial Navy. Finally, it must not be forgotten that the Colony of Newfoundland contributes £3,000 annually towards Naval Defence.

These monetary contributions to the Imperial Navy,

though exceedingly small and not enough to defray the cost of one first-class cruiser, are at the same time a good beginning, and are undoubtedly the forerunner of larger things. It is a sign of the times that the Oversea States are beginning to realise their responsibilities, as well as their privileges, in the Empire.

But what is of far more importance than any monied contribution is that men from the Dominions now enter the Navy. A branch of the Royal Naval Reserve is established in Australia and New Zealand. In the Colony of Newfoundland a branch of the Royal Naval Reserve has also been established, consisting of over six hundred of her fishermen, who have in them the making of excellent seamen. The Admiralty in time expects to extend that number to two thousand.

Moreover, a splendid Naval Reserve for the Imperial Navy could be formed from Canada's 75,000 sailors and fishermen on the Atlantic coast.

It is probable that the Naval Reserve, so far as Australia is concerned, will be enrolled for service with the Australian Navy. For some years now thirteen nominations for naval cadetships at Osborne are given every year: eight to the Commonwealth, two each to New Zealand and Cape Colony, and one to Natal. This advisable policy was adopted in order to secure more colonial-born officers in the Imperial Navy.

Last but by no means least among the Dominions who are concerned in the primacy of the British Navy is India. Her sea-borne trade is considerably over £200,000,000 and is increasing at a most rapid rate. The time seems near when an Indian Ocean Fleet should be established as a part of the Navy, and maintained by the Indian Government. This fleet could be based alternately on Ceylon and the Straits, and should be composed of a complete battle squadron and a cruiser squadron. The advantages of such a fleet, based on Colombo and Singapore, are manifest. The Indian Ocean under our control is as essential to us as the Mediterranean. It is a point of strategy for naval action in the Western Pacific, the

South Atlantic, and the Mediterranean. It thus has a direct influence over the defence of Canada, Australia, and South Africa. Such a fleet should be created by the United Kingdom and maintained by the Indian Government in the same way as the British Army in India.

What must be guarded against, particularly by the Dominions, is any subsidence of the maritime spirit of the Empire, on which spirit its existence depends. In this connection the following quotation of Lord Selborne,* formerly First Lord of the Admiralty, is most apt:—

“I want to bring Australasia, Canada, and South Africa to understand, in the sense that the average Englishman understands it, that the sea is the one material source of our greatness and our power; the main bond of union; the real source of our strength. If I may use such a mixed metaphor—that the sea is to the Empire as the breath of life; but it cannot be done, I opine, so long as we are only receivers of money. I want to see from all parts of the Empire a personal contribution to the Navy, so that it may not only be an abstract Admiralty to govern the Navy, but an Admiralty that has won the confidence of the Colonies, because the Colonies understand its policy, and because in each Colony there are officers and men belonging to the Navy—an integral part of the Navy.”

This quotation contains the gist of the whole question of naval strength. We are informed that our existence as an Empire is maintained by our maritime supremacy. But in some parts of this essentially Oceanic Empire of ours there is a danger of this important fact being lost sight of, or, at least, not receiving the proper consideration it deserves. “The sea is to the Empire as the breath of life” is the very apt metaphor used by Lord Selborne. Without a doubt our chief defence is the Navy. It is, as strategists say, “our first line of defence.” For the primary object of an enemy is to

* Address delivered at the Imperial Conference of 1902.

endeavour to defeat or destroy "our first line," without which he could only at the most hazardous risk attempt with troops the invasion of the United Kingdom, Australia, or some other British Dominion. It would also be impossible, successfully, to reduce the people of the United Kingdom to starvation, or, at least, to great privations, until an enemy had first wrested from us "the Command of the Sea," either by absolute defeat or a series of naval reverses which would give it to him. So long, then, as we are able to uphold our naval supremacy, so long will the Empire be free from invasion. India, however, with her north-west frontier, must rely also for protection on land from her Russian neighbour, as must Canada in event of a war with her neighbour, the United States, which, it may be hoped, is improbable. The "command of the sea" is, nevertheless, necessary to both, in case of land invasion, in order that the other parts of the Empire might send aid. In this regard the value of our alliance with Japan is realised. For troops can be despatched from Japan to India, and their passage rendered safe by our Mediterranean Squadron, which would close the Suez Canal against the ships of an enemy. While Eastern waters are dominated by the fleets of Japan, Great Britain, and the United States, helpful either as neutrals or allies.

A combination of Powers directed against us with success would mean the destruction of the Empire, in the loss of India, and of the supremacy of the sea, "the breath of life" of the Empire. Such a catastrophe would leave all parts in an isolated condition, devoid of any surety of a British future.

The next chapter will endeavour to show the dangers arising wherein this may be so. Prospects such as these, therefore, should induce us all to engage energetically in the great construction-work of Imperial Defence.

CHAPTER III.

FOREIGN NATIONS AND SEA-POWER.

IN the preceding chapter was treated the cost of the increased naval burdens endured by the United Kingdom, and the equity as well as the necessity of the Oversea Dominions assuming a substantial share in our Imperial obligations. In this chapter will be shown the growth and aspirations of our foreign rivals in their efforts to supplant us in our maritime supremacy.

The two-Power standard for the Navy must be maintained by the British Empire as a whole—no longer alone by the overburdened shoulders of the Mother Country.

Germany has clearly announced her intention of being the second naval Power, and it is her ultimate object to be the first. In 1900, on the 1st January, the Emperor said: "As my grandfather reorganised the Army, so I shall reorganise my Navy . . . that it may stand on the same level as my Army." And the preamble of the great Navy Bill of 1900 stated that the German Empire did not need a navy "as strong as that of the greatest Sea Power," but a fleet which would be powerful enough, as that Empire "will not be in a position to concentrate all its forces against us," to enable them to so frustrate that Empire as to "jeopardise its own supremacy."

Now the traditional policy of the British Navy is to concentrate, but it must be quite apparent that this cannot be done without some modifications. Certainly it cannot do so to the same extent as the German Navy, which can and does, without inconvenience, concentrate practically the whole of its naval force in the North Sea. The British Navy, however, has to protect a trade and a coast-line of 43,000 miles in extent. The German Navy, therefore, only calculates on having to meet

about 60 per cent. of the force of the British Navy, and for that it is preparing itself.

Although it is to be regretted, it is mere blind folly for well-intentioned pacifists to state that Germany has no sinister designs upon the integrity of the British Empire. To-day we are the stumbling-block of her *Weltpolitik* and *Machtpolitik*. For Germany aims at extending her dominions in Holland and Belgium. She must have more ports and a greater seaboard. Moreover, it is a sore point with German statesmen that their country plays such an unimportant rôle as a Colonial Power. The German possessions in Africa and elsewhere are not self-supporting, and the total white population in 1911 was not over ten thousand, a great proportion of whom were officials, and not colonists. Germany, therefore, cannot help but look with envious eyes upon the prosperous British Dominions in America, Africa, and Australia. The question brought before the Germans is, Where is their ever-increasing population to find room for expansion? Heretofore the surplus has gone to foreign States, lost to their Fatherland. This is not pleasing to the German mind. But the world seems to be about divided up. It was owing to these reflections that the Kaiser said :—

“Unsere Zukunft liegt auf dem Wasser”—“Our future lies on the sea.” Several years back, also, Count, now Prince, von Buelow, speaking in the Reichstag on the Navy Act, said : “It is not to be tolerated that any foreign Power should say to us ‘The world is disposed of.’ We shall not permit any foreign Power to push us aside, whether in commerce or politics. Like the British, the French, and the Russians, we also have a right to a Greater Germany.” While the German Emperor, in 1900, on 3rd July, said : “The ocean is indispensable for German greatness. . . . Neither on it nor across it in the distance must any great decision be again consummated without Germany and the German Emperor.”

But where is the territory for a Greater Germany? The world is about all occupied. South America is

under the protection of the United States, with its powerful fleet. The rise of Japan will prevent any further division of China and other parts of Asia, while Morocco and Tripoli are under French and Italian influence. The other choicest spots of the globe are under British dominion. It is upon some of these spots that Germany has cast envious eyes. For that reason Germany entered upon an aggressive naval programme, for, as the Kaiser has said, her future lies on the sea. These factors now cause grave consideration. They only go further in demonstrating the absolute necessity of the British Dominions helping to support the British Navy, which must continue at all costs to maintain "the Command of the Sea." If otherwise, the history of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries may repeat itself in regard to the change of ownership of the Colonies.

For several centuries the British Empire has been the most powerful maritime Power. Indeed, by this being so, we have, from a simple Kingdom, been created an Empire. To-day our supremacy in that direction is being challenged by two Powers, comparatively new in the ranks of the nations—modern Germany and the United States. While France, for years a great naval Power and our former rival, is no longer reckoned by us in the same category. The development of the German Empire and the United States is, therefore, of mushroom growth. Bismarck, the founder of his Empire, informed Blücher that "Up to the year 1866 we pursued a Prusso-German policy, from 1866-70 a German European policy, and henceforward a world policy." Modern Germany created in Bismarck, Von Moltke, Treitschke, and others a series of great men, ambitious for their Fatherland; and their means to achieve their purpose were often Jesuitical in the extreme.

At this period there became inaugurated the great, though unscrupulous, policy of *Machtpolitik*—the policy of force. This was the creed of Bismarck, and it

was most ably expounded by Treitschke and his lieutenants in the lecture halls of the universities throughout the German Empire. Treitschke was firmly of the opinion that in years to come the German and British Empires would clash, and he lectured accordingly. "The last settlement," he once said, "the settlement with England, will probably be the lengthiest and the most difficult."

Let us hope that if this is to be so, it will not be alone with England that Treitschke's country will have to settle, but with a firmly United British Empire.

In 1862 Bismarck, on becoming Prime Minister of Prussia, caused Von Moltke and Von Roon to re-organise the army. In 1864, when the organisation had been perfected, Prussia attacked and defeated Denmark and thereupon annexed Schleswig-Holstein, thus obtaining Kiel as a port. In 1866 Prussia followed up her success in an attack upon Austria, and within two months she had succeeded in adding Hanover, Hesse, and Nassau to her domain. In 1870, through the unscrupulous alteration of the Ems telegram by Bismarck, war was declared between Prussia and France. The result was the annexation of Alsace and Lorraine, and an indemnity of £200,000,000 paid by France to Prussia, who thereupon formed the German Confederation into the German Empire and established the most scientific and powerful army in the world.

From this it can be seen that Germany would not hesitate to attack us if she thought we were unprepared.

During the Boer War, in an article in the *Deutsche Rundschau*, Von der Goltz thus wrote:—

"The material foundations of our power are broad enough to warrant the thought of successful opposition to British supremacy. Germany must meet this war if it comes—and must lose no time in making her preparations."

Upon the passing of the German Navy Act was

formed the German Navy League. It was thus that the *Quarterly Review* spoke of it :—

“ The German ‘ Flottenverein,’ or Navy League, boasts a million paying members and is the largest and most spirited patriotic organisation of its kind that has ever existed in any country. It draws its adherents from all parts of the Empire. It is strong in the South German cities like Munich and in the northern sea-ports. It is filled with pan-Germanic feeling, and it is, of course, saturated with anti-British sentiment. The open aim of this organisation is the eventual achievement of naval supremacy. The achievement of that aim would mean, of course, the destruction of the British Empire.”

While in *Our German Cousins*, a *Daily Mail* publication, it says : “ It was a close imitation of the British Navy League, but with this difference, that it enjoyed from the first the patronage of all the German royalties. Prince Henry of Prussia became its patron, and the leaders of the German nobility enrolled themselves in its ranks. It grew in strength with marvellous rapidity till to-day it numbers over a million members, till the circulation of its journal, *Die Flotte*, reaches nearly half a million, till its publications and maps are seen throughout Germany, in barbers’ shops, in hotels, in railway stations. It maintains armies of lecturers; it gives cinematograph shows everywhere. While the British Navy League has a revenue of only about £3,500, the German Navy League has a revenue exceeding £50,000. For more than ten years it has carried out an educational campaign throughout Germany in favour of an all-powerful fleet, until to-day its work is practically done.”

From this it can be readily seen that the creed of *Machtpolitik* is still omnipotent and has the Emperor and his counsellors for its priests and devotees—men of the type of Professor Schiemann and of the late Herr Holstein have succeeded Treitschke and his colleagues. It is this creed of *Machtpolitik* which

humiliated France during the Morocco trouble in 1905; and but for the *entente cordiale* would have done so again in 1910. It is this creed which made possible the annexation of Herzegovina and Bosnia by Austria, rendering the treaty of Berlin so much waste paper—a treaty signed and upheld for more than thirty years by the leading Powers of Europe. Count Aerenthal could not and would not have accomplished this had he not known in this instance of German support. It is a question, however, whether German statesmen do not regard those Balkan provinces as a loan. The time may come when the German Empire may impose its beneficent suzerainty upon Austria herself. For the time being, however, Austria has what she wanted—thanks to Germany; and Germany by this has bound Austria to her. The result of it all is that in 1909 it was announced that Austria, who for many years had no really first-class battleships, is now building four ships of the Dreadnought type. These, for all practical purposes, may be deemed an integral part of the German Navy. Germany's subtle object being, of course, to worry us in the Mediterranean as well as in the North Sea. This may be regarded as a menace to us, thus threatening, as it will, our direct route to Egypt and India.

To-day it is the North Sea that is the strategic base of the British Navy, and yet in 1905 we maintained no fleet in the North Sea. It was at that time that the Admiralty stated there was no need for a naval base at Rosyth. Now the construction of Rosyth as a base for our fleet is being hurried.

By the year 1920, providing the 1912 proposals are carried out, Germany will have thirty-nine ships of the Dreadnought class, besides another ten battleships of mixed armaments, older, but still efficient, and five serviceable armoured cruisers. The rest of the fleet will be made up of thirty-eight protected cruisers, 144 destroyers, and nearly eighty submarines.

Unless, therefore, there is an immediate change in the naval policy of the rest of the Powers, Germany will

by 1920 have a navy greater numerically than, and in fighting power far superior to, that of the combined fleets of all the Continental Powers. And her army, if not the largest, will still be the most efficient. In the Mediterranean she will have the co-operation of the fleets of Austria-Hungary and Italy. Indeed our position in that sea is even in 1912 causing us grave concern. What must also be considered in this connection is that the German fleet is concentrated in the North Sea, whereas ours is necessarily somewhat scattered, and, owing to the recent policy of local navies for the Dominions, this but enlarges the problem.

But quite apart from the aggressive building programme of the German Empire, our supremacy at sea is threatened, perhaps in a less vital degree, but still threatened, by the United States. That country has within a few years built up a huge fleet. And although Mr. Asquith, in 1909, would not take the United States into consideration when calculating our naval needs, yet there is a real danger that within the next ten or fifteen years "the Command of the Sea" may pass, if not to Germany, to the United States, for its resources are greater than those of the United Kingdom.

During the Roosevelt administration certain members of the Government openly advocated a navy of equal if not greater strength than that of Great Britain. While certain naval officers, whose extreme zeal and patriotism run away with their judgment, have seriously entertained hopes that the United States will have a navy not only the strongest in the world, but a navy equal to the combined fleets of the world. Wild as these ideas undoubtedly are, they are the outcome of a sentiment of jingoism among a great portion of the population. That the United States, owing to its new status as a Power, needs a strong navy is not denied, but that her requirements call for a navy equal in strength to the British Navy, which has to protect an enormous commerce afloat in every sea, and to uphold the integrity of all the scattered British Dominions, is utterly ridiculous.

It is to be hoped that the good practical common sense of the American people will ultimately dissipate such wild schemes.

The resources of the United States are greater than those of the United Kingdom, and eventually the resources of the German Empire will also be greater. In the future, therefore, it is doubtful that, under such conditions, we could still retain the "Command of the Sea." But notwithstanding these facts, the resources of the British Empire are many times greater than those of either the United States or Germany. If, then, the British self-governing States enter into an equitable share in Imperial Defence, the danger of our being unable to uphold the "Command of the Sea" will vanish. It is to be hoped that, aside from reasons of sentiment and patriotism, those British Dominions will appreciate the gravity of the situation and will rise to the occasion. For the possibility that another Power should supplant us in our naval supremacy, even though that Power be the United States, would be a *contre-temps* the seriousness of which can scarcely be appreciated.

The only reasonable method to pursue is to make the British Navy the Empire's Navy, supported by the self-governing Dominions as well as by the United Kingdom.

In view of all this, and particularly in view of the pan-Germanic aspirations, the British Empire is to-day confronted by a danger unparalleled in its history.

CHAPTER IV.

THE NECESSITY FOR AN IMPERIAL NAVY.

AS may now be seen the problem of Imperial defence is fraught with great difficulties. Yet defence is perhaps the greatest question involving Imperial unity, and must, therefore, be grappled with successfully. The principal trouble is the extreme need of an efficient organisation for the Naval and Military

forces. These lack homogeneity, which is absolutely essential to a proper defence. What this Empire requires, and has not, is a *Kriegsverein*. The component parts of the Empire to-day rely far too much upon methods of local defence. It is no doubt a natural failing; a sense of patriotism is invariably developed through a sentiment of local ownership of defence. It is the result of the spirit of self-reliance, which is so great a characteristic of our compatriots oversea. But, however advisable such a policy may be as regards military defence, and in that respect there is much in it, yet in the case of naval policy it is the reverse of wisdom.

Unfortunately, while willing to undertake a portion of the burdens of Imperial Defence, most of the Dominions at present are in favour of the creation of local navies as the best means of maintaining the sea-power of the British Empire. But, as has already been partially noticed, the policy of local navies is unwise on political, financial, and strategical grounds.

Politically, the establishment of local navies for each of the Dominions will cause, rightly or wrongly, an impression in the minds of the foreign Powers that the Empire is in rapid progress of disintegration. They will argue that separate armaments must before long entail a separate foreign policy, and with it a separate and distinct diplomacy and diplomatic corps, which eventually must mean independence and the end of the Empire as an empire. And their conclusions would be justified. The idea of separate navies for a so-called United Empire is nothing more than the partial success of centrifugal tendencies in a system where they are already far more than barely existent.

Financially the policy of local navies is unsound, seeing that the cost, in the aggregate, will of necessity be far more than if the component parts were each to contribute to an Imperial Navy. By the latter the Empire would gain the greatest security at the least possible outlay.

In the creation of navies for Canada and Australia the

Governments interested must consider the naval strength of the United States, Russia, Japan, and Germany, and two of these Powers, Germany and the United States, will have to be reckoned with in the Atlantic as well as in the Pacific. A navy for either Australia or Canada will, therefore, be of little use unless the Governments concerned are prepared to appropriate, at the lowest, a sum of £5,000,000. The cost of even one first-class cruiser amounts to at least £750,000. It is essential also to have several second-class cruisers, as well as a number of submarines and torpedo-boats and all the supplies necessary to an efficient naval force. This outlay would amount at the lowest calculation to £1,500,000 per annum, including the interest yearly on the capital cost.

But under this arrangement Canada and Australia will have to take a subordinate place among the small nations who are unable to afford battleships. Mr. Carlyon Bellairs, R.N., an authority on naval defence, in an article entitled "The Navy and the Empire," included in that splendid book "The Empire and the Century," thus wrote on this question:—

"'Only numbers can annihilate,' said Nelson; and even when the Colonies are as rich as Holland, Denmark, Spain, or Belgium, they cannot hope to do better than those countries which are unable to afford battleships. The so-called battleships of Austria* are quite unfit to lie in the line of battle, while to build a Dreadnought outside of Great Britain or Germany would probably cost about two and a-half millions sterling, or nearly as much as we raise by a penny on the income-tax. Indeed, one of the most significant changes since Nelson's time, when we found it indispensable that we should deal with the battleships of the Portuguese and Danish navies, is that the business of owning battleships has become far too expensive for any but the seven great maritime Powers."

In this connection it might be well to point out that

* Austria is now building four ships of the Dreadnought class.

even to build a Dreadnought in England requires an outlay of about £1,750,000.

From the standpoint of efficiency, local navies are equally undesirable. It should be taken into consideration that ships-of-war now become obsolete in a few years, and it is extremely costly to replace them. The personnel of such navies will be apt to become "stale" if it is confined always in the same ships and in the same place, subject to the same influences. For a high standard of efficiency and morale to be maintained it is essential that there should be periodical changes in a ship's company, and, above all, that the divisions in a fleet be sent on extended cruises, visiting other countries. In the case of local navies, tied to local waters, this cannot be, and the result will tell considerably both against efficiency and morale.

In time of war it is, of course, to be assumed that the Canadian and Australian navies would eventually be placed under Imperial command, but they would appear at a great disadvantage, for they would necessarily differ somewhat in organisation and training, not having been constantly employed as a part of the whole fleet. An admiral, to take successful command in war of a naval force, should have manœuvred the whole of it in peace frequently before being called upon to take it into action. It is more than likely, however, that in the event of hostilities a Canadian or Australian navy will remain in local waters for the supposed protection of local interests, and might, therefore, at some critical juncture, neglect to concentrate with the Imperial Fleet. Different organisation, division of command and responsibility, therefore, will probably end in demoralisation. A fleet to be effective and powerful must therefore have been united and under one command *in peace* as well as in war. To be otherwise is to court disaster. That the proper defence of this Empire is for its several units to have local navies is nothing more than a dangerous fallacy, as we may find some day to our cost should this doctrine be long pursued.

Alexander Hamilton, the great soldier and statesman

of the American Revolution, was faced by this same problem, but finally managed to overcome the narrow views of many in the individual States as to State control of naval defence. Thus he speaks :—

“ We have heard much of the fleets of Britain, and if we are wise the time may come when the fleets of America may engage attention. But if one national Government had not so regulated the navigation of Britain as to make it a nursery for seamen, if one national Government had not called forth all the national means and materials for forming fleets, their prowess and their thunder would never have been celebrated. Let England have its navigation and fleet; let Scotland have its navigation and fleet; let Wales have its navigation and fleet; let Ireland have its navigation and fleet; let those four of the constituent parts of the British Empire be under four independent Governments, and it is easy to perceive how soon they would dwindle into comparative insignificance.”

Let us realise that the sea is all one—it is, in fact, a British lake—and when one considers that sixty per cent. of the commerce afloat is British, such a statement is not to be considered as mere idle boasting. That a few ships for the defence of Australia, Canada, or South Africa, confined solely to local waters, make an effective defence, has been disputed and ridiculed by all great authorities on naval strategy. This fact is fully borne out by the events which took place in the war between Russia and Japan. Had the Russian Government concentrated the greater part of its navy in the Far East and unitedly attacked the Japanese, instead of separating the fleet—part being bottled up at Port Arthur, and part in Vladivostock, while the other squadrons were in Europe—the results might have been different. As it was, the Japanese destroyed the Russian fleet by sections. These lessons should be a warning to the British Empire not to think of local navies for defence, but at once to put all their energies into securing an efficient Imperial Navy for offensive purposes.

Canada and Australia, each with its local squadron, or without it, would be absolutely at the mercy of an enemy should the rest of the British Navy have lost the command of the sea. Our proper defence is for the Imperial Navy to concentrate at points where the enemy are gathered in force. If a hostile fleet suffer defeat in the Pacific or the North Sea, that is of more importance to Canada and Australasia than if their coasts were each guarded by a strong local squadron.

Lord Selborne grasped this question thoroughly, and ably summed up the situation when speaking on the subject of naval defence at the Imperial Conference of 1902 :

“ There was a time in this country, not so very long ago either, when naval strategists regarded the naval problem mainly from the point of view of defence. That, I submit, is altogether heretical. The real problem which this Empire has to face in the case of a naval war is simply and absolutely to find out where the ships of the enemy are, to concentrate the greatest possible force where those ships are, and to destroy those ships. That is the only possible method of protecting this Empire from the efforts which other navies may make to damage her commerce, or her territory. It follows from this that there can be no ‘ localisation ’ of naval forces in the strict sense of the word. There can be no local allocation of ships to protect the mouth of the Thames, to protect Liverpool, to protect Sydney, or to protect Halifax.

“ The sea is all one, and the British Navy, therefore, must be all one ; and its solitary task in war must be to seek out the ships of the enemy, wherever they are to be found, and destroy them. At whatever spot, in whatever sea, these ships are found and destroyed, there the whole Empire will be simultaneously defended in its territory, its trade, and its interests. If, on the contrary, the idea should unfortunately prevail that the problem is one of local defence, and that each part of the Empire can be content to have its allotment of ships for the purpose of the separate protection of an individual spot, the only possible result would be that an

enemy who had discarded this heresy, and combined his fleets, would *attack in detail and destroy those separated British squadrons which, united, could have defied defeat.*"

Nothing could be more explicit, or better show us the folly of any other method. What must then be realised is that the naval problem is not one of defence, but rather "to find out where the ships of the enemy are, and to destroy those ships." In every successful period of naval warfare the British commanders have acted on the offensive. Nelson and his lieutenants always chased the French fleets in order to force them to give battle. There is, however, one instance where the English Navy adopted the tactics of local defence, and kept the ships in port. It was in the reign of Charles II. during a war with Holland. The result of these tactics was that the Dutch fleet sailed up the Medway, and burnt our warships at their moorings. It should be clearly understood, therefore, that the naval policy of the Empire cannot be one of local defence, and if we are to uphold our naval supremacy in the future, as in the past, we must continue our traditional *rôle* of acting on the offensive.

The theatre of naval war in the near future is apt to be the North Sea. What will then count will be superiority of battleships in the North Sea, and not second-class cruisers and submarines thousands of miles away in another sphere of action. The only reasonable method to pursue, therefore, is to make the British Navy the Empire's Navy, supported by the self-governing States as well as by the United Kingdom, just as the German Navy is the one and indivisible force of that great empire.

The British Navy has existed as a power in the world for several centuries. Through long years of experience and trial, it has succeeded in storing up a vast amount of knowledge and skill, and to-day is the acknowledged head of all things naval. The Dominions within the Empire, and sharing the Imperial Navy, would have the great benefit of all this vast amount of

stored-up knowledge and skill of a century or more of naval growth. As Lord Brassey has said :—

“ Our Navy has been brought to its present position by the traditions of the past, by the experience of service in every part of the globe, by peace manœuvres on a vast scale, and, lastly, by the maintenance in the highest attainable perfection of training establishments for every branch of the Service. Our gunnery and torpedo schools, the Naval University of Greenwich, the Schools for the Training of Naval Architects and Naval Engineers, are indispensable for efficiency, and could not be produced by the comparatively narrow resources of independent Colonial Governments.”

In 1909 in the Canadian House of Commons on the naval debate, the resolution, among other things, said :

“ The House is of opinion that *under the present constitutional relations* between the Mother Country and the self-governing Dominions, the payment of regular and periodical contributions to the Imperial Treasury for naval and military purposes would not, so far as Canada is concerned, be the most satisfactory solution of the question of defence.”

This resolution shows the present defective system of Empire governance. It is this question of Imperial Defence, more than any other, that shows the pressing need of a federal system for the Empire. It is to be hoped, therefore, that the time is not far distant when the “ constitutional relations between the Mother Country and the self-governing Dominions ” may be so altered that “ the payment of regular and periodical contributions to the Imperial Treasury for naval and military purposes ” will be regarded by Canada and the other States as the most satisfactory solution of the Empire’s defence.

Until a proper federation is obtained the several States should be adequately represented at the Admiralty and on the Committee of Imperial Defence, and in an Imperial Council, as advocated in this work.

Let us trust, therefore, that before long the British people at home and oversea will realise the necessity of having a true Imperial Navy, supported by the resources in men and money of the whole Empire. As shown, the time is not far off when the forty-five millions of people in the United Kingdom will not alone be able to compete with the hundred and twenty odd millions of Germans and Austrians, and the ninety millions of Americans. There are, however, fourteen million Britons outside the Mother Country now anxious to assist, and it is to be hoped that they will before long participate in an Imperial Navy, and not fritter away their resources upon costly local naval forces of doubtful value, thus reducing the strength of the Empire to a mere rope of sand.

CHAPTER V.

IMPERIAL DEFENCE—THE MILITARY FORCES.

WHILE the greatest consideration in any survey of Imperial Defence must be given to the Navy, the subordinate though important point of Military Defence must not be overlooked; each is, for obvious reasons, necessary to the other. In the case of a war with Russia, we would need an efficient army to reinforce our troops in India. This might also be said of Canada in the event of a war with the United States. In order to insure the safe transportation of troops, the supremacy of the British Navy must, therefore, be undoubted. In the event of our suffering absolute naval defeat, the Empire would be at an end, each part setting up for itself as best it could; and India would be thrown back into the past, subject again to internal anarchy and invasion. The invasion of the British Isles would then follow, and with very probable success, as an invader would cut our lines of communication and establish a blockade,

which would in a few weeks reduce the kingdom by means of starvation.

The only other exigency in which our land forces would be called upon to repel any invasion, and in fact the only time in which such an invasion could become really at all practicable, would be during the temporary absence of the major portion of the home squadrons in another sphere of action.

Assuming, however, that an enemy might for a while control the Channel or North Sea, thus making a descent upon our coasts practicable though hazardous, then upon the land forces in the Kingdom would fall the responsibility of repelling any such invasion until the return of the fleet. In this case, a descent might be a feint, made either to prevent the Home fleet from leaving local waters, or, on the other hand, to force a speedy return, thus preventing it from co-operating with the rest of the Navy for destroying the enemy, wherever gathered in force. Were the Kingdom prepared against such an eventuality, it might dissipate any such idea, or at all events make it, if attempted, ineffective.

This can also be said in regard to Australia, who with an efficient force could in the event of a descent on her coasts being made beat back, or at least hold an invader in check until the arrival or return of the Pacific Fleet, which might have been engaged in chasing or giving battle to the enemy in another sphere of action.

Should an invasion be attempted from India's North-West frontier, the "Command of the Sea" would be essential in order to send reinforcements from other parts of the Empire, and this is equally correct in regard to Canada, who would need reinforcements in the event of a land invasion, from her big neighbour, the United States.

Our military forces are then required for:—

1. The protection of the United Kingdom and other dominions during absence of the fleet.

2. A strong expeditionary force always in readiness for service in Europe or oversea.
3. The protection of India, with ability for reinforcements when necessary.
4. Garrisons for dependencies and naval and military bases.
5. Police work in our small wars in India and other dependencies.

The military forces of the Empire are estimated at over a million men. Yet these forces are far from being efficient in many vital points, lacking as they do homogeneity. The great defect heretofore has been a lack of proper organisation between the forces of the Imperial and Indian armies and the militia and permanent forces in the Dominions. This is still further illustrated by the practice that has long permitted the Foreign and Colonial Offices to maintain forces of their own not under War Office control.

Quite recently, however, a change for the better has gradually taken place, and within the past few years several important reforms and innovations have occurred. To begin with, the Committee of the Cabinet on Imperial Defence, which was established a few years ago, is now constituted as a department, over which the Prime Minister presides and appoints its members, and is provided with a permanent nucleus. The non-political, or permanent, members being a secretary appointed for five years, two naval officers chosen by the Admiralty, two military officers by the War Office, and two Indian officers nominated by the Viceroy, besides one or more representatives of the Dominions; all these appointments being for a period of two years. The duty of this permanent body is to determine any and all questions relating to the defence of the Empire generally. This undoubtedly is a most wise and progressive policy, and should insure a continuity of policy in Imperial Defence.

Since the Imperial Conference of 1907 and the Imperial Defence Conference of 1909, it has at last

been decided to establish an Imperial General Staff, which central body would be linked up with the local general staffs in the several Dominions. The germ, therefore, of an Imperial Army has begun. The forces of the whole Empire are to be gradually brought into closer contact, trained on a common pattern, and capable in war of taking their place as complete divisions in an Imperial Army.

In 1908, Mr. (now Viscount) Haldane, the then Secretary of State for War, developed a new scheme for purely home defence, by turning the old Volunteer force into a Territorial Army—an army complete in all its departments in the proper sense of the word. This the old Volunteer force never was, so that the formation of the Territorial Army is undoubtedly a step in the right direction. Unfortunately, to make this force really effective, a far longer training is required than is now considered requisite. The Militia have been turned into the Special Reserve, and are now practically an integral part of the Regular Army. It is to be regretted that in spite of the progress made by the creation of a Territorial Army, the same Minister responsible for this seriously reduced the strength of the Regular Army.

The military forces of the Empire are in general now composed of the Imperial Regular Army, with its Reserve and Special Reserve, the Indian Army, and the Auxiliary Forces of the Territorial Army, Militia and Volunteers in the United Kingdom, the Dominions and Dependencies. The Imperial Regular Army numbered in 1912 some 260,000 men, with a reserve of 134,000; of this 76,000 were stationed in India. The remainder are at home, in South Africa, Egypt, and the various Colonies and Dependencies. It is supposed that a field force of over 100,000 men from the home establishment of the Regular Army can be despatched abroad on short notice to any part of the Empire which might be threatened. This number would be replaced at home by the Reserves, and if necessary by embodying the Special Reserve and the Territorial Army.

The grand total of the military forces of the Empire in 1912 was made up thus :—

United Kingdom	735,000
Colonies	100,000
India and Burmah	195,000
Indian Feudatory States	
Imperial Service Troops	20,000
<hr/>	
Total for Empire	1,050,000

This, at first glance, seems a substantial and adequate military force for the defence of the British Empire, especially when we consider the primacy of the Navy. But, as has been observed, this force is a heterogeneous mass, and in no sense of the word an Imperial Army. That it may become so in time is to be hoped. It would be far better to have a smaller showing on paper and a higher efficiency in the field. It would be even preferable to have only one-half this number if such a force were in a high state of efficiency in all its branches. This may be said of the Regular Army as well as of the Home and Colonial Auxiliary forces.

In the South African War we did not suffer to the full extent from our many mistakes. The Boers, though a brave and exceedingly mobile enemy, were in no way an organised and highly trained army. They therefore neglected to follow up and take advantage of many opportunities which a thoroughly modern army would have done to our great disadvantage. Thus we had time to retrieve our blunders. In a war with a great Power we would not have this opportunity or time to rectify our mistakes, and many of our auxiliary troops both at home and from the Dominions could not with fairness in the somewhat raw condition in which they were found in the South African campaign, be pitted against the highly trained troops of an enemy. If the conduct of our kin in the Dominions in regard to the South African campaign can be taken as a precedent, it would seem that they wish to help in the

defence of the Empire in the future when occasion presents itself; but however great the ardour and loyalty of our fellow subjects over the sea may be to aid us, such troops hastily raised from such material could only be used against trained professional troops with the greatest caution.

There are, in the several Dominions, militia forces which, on a peace footing, amount to more than 100,000 men composed of the flower of the manhood of the Empire. But in their comparatively untrained condition their military value, at present, is naturally not very high.

A change for the better has occurred, however, in the creation of the Committee on Imperial Defence, that of an Imperial General Staff and the recommendations of Lord Kitchener and Sir John French being cordially accepted by the Dominions. These forces, therefore, show excellent promise of becoming efficient divisions in the Imperial Army of the future. Certainly, it is to be hoped that this will transpire, for this Empire will soon find an Imperial Army as vitally necessary as an Imperial Navy. This the next chapter will demonstrate.

CHAPTER VI.

THE DEFENCE OF FRANCE—THE PROBLEM OF IMPERIAL DEFENCE.

WITHIN the past few years the military side of Imperial Defence has grown considerably in importance, until to-day the British Empire needs a strong and efficient Army as well as an invincible Navy.

Mr. Balfour not long ago stated that the problem of Imperial Defence was the defence of Afghanistan. Well-known military strategists to-day agree that the problem of Imperial Defence is now primarily the defence of France.

The nearer and yet greater danger to the British Empire is not an invasion of the British Isles by Germany, but of a German invasion of France.

Such an invasion, if not checked, would extend from Paris to Lyons and from the English Channel to the Mediterranean. Moreover the German Empire, if triumphant, would not be content with an indemnity, but, as in 1871, would annex territory. It would undoubtedly take permanent possession of the northern provinces, in that way obtaining the ports of Calais and Boulogne. With this accomplished, the absorption of Belgium and Holland would before long become a *fait accompli*.

Invasion of the British Isles would then be threatened not from Hamburg and Bremen, across the turbulent German ocean, but from Calais, Boulogne, Antwerp, Rotterdam, Flushing, and Ostend.

It is thus that the problem of Imperial Defence is now the defence of France. It is for this reason that we now need a strong and efficient Army as well as an invincible Navy. For the British Navy, however powerful, could not prevent the subjugation of France. It could not prevent the annexation of Cherbourg or Calais, nor the absorption of the Netherlands.

With the foregoing accomplished, Germany would have for ports Calais on one side of the Channel and Cherbourg on the other. Beside which she would have Amsterdam, Rotterdam, and Antwerp, which, as Napoleon said, "is a pistol pointed at the heart of England." In Belgium she would have Ostend, while the Dutch Navy would become an integral part of the German Navy.

To prevent this there are now but two real obstacles, the French Army and the British fleet. The defeat of one, however, would likely eliminate the other, as Austerlitz overbore Trafalgar. Whether we contract an alliance with France or merely maintain the *entente cordiale* the facts are the same : that the subjugation of France means the overthrow of the British Empire.

The question at issue, therefore, is whether the subjugation of France by Germany is feasible.

The French Army, while large and in many ways most excellent, is numerically inferior to the German. Moreover, it is the opinion of many experts that it is also inferior in organisation and preparedness for war. In the valley of the upper Meuse, behind its fortified slopes, it might easily maintain itself. But with an occupation of the Low Countries by the German Army, and an attack along the frontier, between the Sambre and the Scheldt, its chances would be far more problematical. Therefore, should France fail in this the British Navy could do nothing. The only hope in this connection is for a British Army to act in conjunction with the French Army. We *should* have a field force of certainly not less than 300,000 men always ready for foreign service. A British Army Corps in Holland and Belgium, or France, hanging on to the flank of the German force, proceeding perhaps from Liège to Namur and thence into France, might reasonably turn the scales in favour of the French. This would also infuse spirit into Holland and Belgium, and insure their mobilisation.

But the British Empire has not to-day a field force of 300,000 trained men capable of immediate mobilisation, although it has a heterogeneous force of over a million men; and the British fleet cannot aid France nor defend the Low Countries.

Our former theory of splendid isolation is shattered. While we have now an Imperial policy we must nevertheless pursue a European policy or we will have no need for an Imperial policy. The balance of power on the Continent is even more vital to us now than it was of yore. A German Empire made up of Germany, Holland, Belgium, part of France, Austria, and probably Turkey would mean the destruction of the British Empire, its fleet, its trade, and its provinces.

What is to prevent this? The British Navy alone cannot do it. A strong British Army must assist; and once more in its annals must it be prepared for service in the Low Countries.

In the Peninsular and Crimean Wars our Army was strong enough to turn the scale. Since then conscription has become the rule among the Powers, and owing to this our Army has become almost a negligible quantity in European politics.

But with the foregoing it would seem that we require in constant readiness a field force of at least 300,000 men in addition to the smaller expeditionary force that we have always contemplated for oversea. Yet, according to Lord Roberts and other experts, we have not even an adequate force for home defence, let alone a force of Regulars for Continental and oversea service.

Lord Roberts, on November 23, 1908, created a sensation in the House of Lords when, in a lengthy speech, he emphatically expressed his opinion as a practical soldier that the military force of the United Kingdom was inadequate, imperfectly trained, and totally unfit to uphold it as a first-class Power. He said that the lessons of the South African War had been forgotten, and he had no hesitation in saying that the forces as a body were to-day as absolutely unfitted and unprepared for war as they were when the South African War broke out. He declared emphatically that the choice lay between conscription or some practical system of universal training, and by this means only would Great Britain be prepared to meet the demands of the Empire in the event of war.

The aims of the National Service League in this regard are worthy of being quoted. The objects of the League are :—

“(1) To insure peace and security for the British Empire by organising our land forces in such a manner that we may not only be able to defend successfully any portion of the Empire against attack, but also that the strength of our defensive arrangements may render attack improbable.

“(2) To improve the moral and physical condition of the nation, and thereby to increase its industrial efficiency. With a view to attaining those two objects the League recommend :

“ First, that the spirit of patriotism and duty towards their country should be instilled into boys in all schools by their teachers ;

“ Secondly, universal physical training of a military character and instruction in the use of the rifle should form part of the curriculum of all schools ;

“ (3) In the case of boys who leave school before eighteen, the continuation of this training up to that age, in cadet corps, boys’ brigades, and similar institutions, under State supervision ; and

“ (4) The encouragement of rifle clubs, and the endeavour to make rifle-shooting a national sport. With regard to the Auxiliary Forces, this League advocated the adoption of all measures which will improve the military efficiency of the existing Auxiliary Forces, and at the same time pave the way for their inclusion in a service of a universal military system for home defence. With that object it urges the organisation of these forces into brigades, divisions, etc., with the necessary staff and equipment as an indispensable first step towards their being able to take the field as a mobile force in the absence of the whole or the greater part of the Regular Army.”

The idea of conscription is repugnant, rightly or wrongly, to the British mind, yet the fact remains that it is so. It would not be necessary, however, for the Empire to adopt conscription if the Auxiliary Forces of the Empire are brought up to a higher state of efficiency by the Governments concerned. But this can really only be by adopting for the Auxiliary Forces some of the proposals of the National Service League.

While conscription on the Continental model is not to be tolerated by the people of the British Empire, some sane system of universal military training is becoming essential.

Australia has paved the way by introducing compulsory military training for its citizens. The United Kingdom and the other Dominions should, therefore, no longer hesitate in doing the same.

This would then permit the Regular Army to rely

upon a strong and substantial reserve in case of a great emergency ; and moreover would allow the greater part of the Regular Army being employed oversea or on the Continent, wherever and whenever necessary. Absolute freedom of action for the fleet would then be attainable, such as is impossible under present-day conditions.

From the Treaty of Westphalia to that at Vienna the Low Countries have been the theatre of European warfare. In all these campaigns there was a British army available and strong enough to turn the scale. To-day the situation seems the same, and points before long to a struggle for dominance in the Low Countries. But a British army is wanting, and while that need is felt there can be no real security for either the French Republic or the British Empire. It is nearly a hundred years since Waterloo, and the forces that may operate in that zone in the near future will probably present a new alignment to the world, thus demonstrating the change in world politics.

CHAPTER VII.

AN IMPERIAL ARMY.

WHILE throughout insisting upon one Navy for the Empire, the problem of military defence renders separate forces for the several States not undesirable, so long as in general direction and training they become co-ordinated into one Imperial whole. In this regard the Empire should have adequate national or territorial forces for home defence, and expeditionary forces for Imperial defence or offence. Such expeditionary forces, if created to-day and in time of peace under local control, in time of war should become a part of the Imperial Army, and thus under Imperial control. "Combination of effort is a fundamental principle of war, and the existence of different schools of thought in an army is fatal to such combination." That which is to be attained is for all

the divisions of a military body to act in war as parts of a whole. This can only be achieved successfully when all the parts are trained and organised by one brain, and to-day the brain of an army is the General Staff. The General Staff must, therefore, be an entity throughout the Empire, and for this to be so its members should all be uniformly trained in one school under one head.

Already some of the Dominions maintain, in an embryo stage, expeditionary troops. The permanent force in both Canada and Australia is being steadily increased. These forces, though, are primarily maintained as instructional corps to the partially trained or territorial troops.

Nevertheless, the Dominions are beginning to realise that it behoves them to take their share of the burdens of Imperial defence proper, as distinguished from purely local defence. As these views become prevalent, substantial expeditionary forces will no doubt spring into being, and perhaps, in time, become part and parcel of the Imperial Regular Army.

From the geographical and strategical point of view this is most desirable. Indeed, it would possibly revolutionise our methods of Imperial defence. It would be the solution to our problem of reinforcing the garrison in any of our posts in the Pacific and Indian Oceans. Geographically, at any rate, the Overseas Dominions are in a better position for this than the Mother Country. Durban, for instance, is 2,000 miles nearer Bombay than Plymouth, and some of the Australian ports are much nearer to India than the English ones. To enable this to be done, the command of the sea in the Indian and Pacific Oceans by the British Navy is essential. It is also probable that the creation of these oversea expeditionary forces as a part of the Imperial Army would have a most favourable influence on the local defence problem of the United Kingdom. It would render it possible for the Mother Country to reorganise her defence system, and thereby give greater freedom to the Navy, such as is impossible to-day. This would con-

siderably add to our regular or striking force, and would enable us to have a strong expeditionary Army for over-sea or Continental service, the need of which is a great handicap to our foreign policy.

Of course, under Federation, if not before, the British Army would become Imperial in the true sense of the word, both money and men being contributed by the several States forming the Federation. This would then, as in the case of the Navy, secure the best possible protection at the least possible cost. Such a policy would be far more sagacious, and conducive to better results as a whole, than if the several States were separate and independent, each keeping up its own local army at great cost and with considerably less results.

To make the Regular Army Imperial in fact as well as in name would be in every way beneficial to the whole Empire. In case of a war in the East or on our North-West Frontier of India, strong reinforcements could be quickly despatched to the scene of hostilities from Australia, New Zealand, and Canada, which, owing to their geographical positions, would be better able to send aid promptly than Great Britain, whose troops, on account of the greater distance, would of necessity arrive late. The fact that a strong advance force from these communities would arrive promptly would have a great effect upon the enemy, and would hold them in check until the main forces would arrive from Great Britain by way of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, across the continent, from the Atlantic to the Pacific. Furthermore, it should be taken into consideration that the liabilities of being forced to resort to actual hostilities are according to the greatness of a nation's capabilities and power of waging war. Therefore, if it were known that strong British contingents were capable of immediate mobilisation in Australasia, South Africa, and Canada, such a consideration might greatly influence any dispute in Europe or Asia to be settled on a peaceful basis.

Great Britain and Ireland, being the most vulnerable, would always be garrisoned by the greater part of the

Army, and for years to come would very probably supply the greatest number of recruits. For Great Britain is by far the oldest settled community and the most densely populated. It would have the largest surplus population from which to draw for that purpose. Nevertheless, it would not be advisable to depend exclusively upon only one part of the Empire for our fighting material.

In this we are met by a problem difficult of solution to-day and probably for some years to come. The United Kingdom has a large surplus population to draw upon for recruiting purposes. The Overseas Dominions have not. The difficulty of obtaining recruits in the Dominions on the present scale of pay and long term of service of the Regular Army would be very great. Our system, in this respect, would for that reason have to be amended somewhat. Our long-service system in the Regular Army is necessary in order to provide garrisons for India and the dependencies. We should probably have to inaugurate a short-service system in the Army, together with the long-service. This might perhaps be confined to oversea regiments. The term of service for these troops might be from two to three years with the Colours and five years in the Reserve. By this means quite substantial forces could be obtained on mobilisation, with a comparatively small peace establishment. Under such conditions it would soon be possible, on the outbreak of war, for Canada to mobilise three divisions, Australia two divisions, and South Africa and New Zealand each one division of the Imperial Army. This would create a large Army Reserve, and the cost would not amount to more than one-third to one-half of that incurred by the personnel of the long-service Army to-day.

This short-service system for a part of the Army could also aid the work of immigration; for recruiting for many years would largely be done in the United Kingdom.

The raising of regiments in the Overseas States for the Imperial Regular Army is practicable to a certain extent to-day. The present existing permanent force

of the Dominions, with some additions, could, as a start, be made a part of the Army. Such regiments as the Royal Canadian Regiment, the Royal Canadian Dragoons, and the Royal Canadian Artillery could then become part of the Imperial Army, just as are now the Royal Fusiliers, the 2nd Dragoons (Scots Greys), and the Royal Artillery. Later we could have also regiments of Royal Australian Rifles, Canadian Fusiliers, New Zealand Light Infantry, and South African Rangers. These regiments, or others, could still instruct the local militia forces, as now. As the population and wealth of the Overseas States increased, and the local recruiting difficulty lessened, this could be further extended to the cavalry. We could then have for regiments the 22nd or New Zealand Lancers, the 23rd Hussars, Royal Canadians, and the 8th Dragoon Guards, the Australian Horse.

The infantry regiments herein suggested could be of two or more regular battalions, and might or might not have each in addition a special reserve battalion. Then might be found an Australian regiment doing duty in India, beside a Welsh or Irish regiment, a Canadian regiment at the Curragh, a New Zealand battalion at Aldershot, and a South African stationed in Gibraltar.

The pay of officers and men of the British Army would of necessity be increased. Perhaps the pay could be regulated according to local conditions, in the same way as is now practised in India with British regiments. That is, an English regiment, if stationed anywhere, for instance, in Canada, could be paid relatively higher than at home, on account of expenses being higher, and *vice-versa*. The pay of the British soldier even to-day should be considerably increased, in spite of the improvements in his condition made of late years. Military and staff colleges should be established in the States, similar to the R.M.C. at Kingston, Ontario. Young gentlemen would be enabled to graduate from there, and to select their corps, without having to come to England as at present.

In this connection there is no real reason why there

should not, under present-day conditions, be an exchange of units between the Mother Country and Overseas States.

The late Premier of New Zealand, Mr. Seddon, advocated the exchange of territorial or militia units. It was, however, left to the single patriotism and munificence of a private individual to start the ball rolling in this respect, in the person of Colonel Sir Henry M. Pellatt, commanding the 3rd Queen's Own Rifles, a regiment of the Canadian militia, who, at his own expense, brought almost the entire regiment to England in 1910 to be employed in the divisional manoeuvres with the regular troops. Such actions should not be left to private individuals, but should be carried out by the Governments concerned.

So far as regular units are concerned, indeed, the War Office a few years ago approached the Canadian Militia Department and offered to send a regiment of the permanent force on service to India or Egypt, to gain valuable training and experience by being employed together with Imperial troops. This was declined at the time, for the reason that the permanent force of Canada was then insufficient for local needs to allow the extended absence of one of its battalions. The matter was, however, left open for future consideration. Since then the strength of the permanent force has been considerably augmented. If, however, there is still this difficulty, why could not an Imperial battalion be sent to Canada in exchange for the Royal Canadian Regiment, which could be stationed in India? If this were to be arranged, it would increase the importance and fighting value of the Colonial permanent force, and would pave the way to embracing that force as an integral part of the Regular Army in the future.

All the same, great progress has been made, and while an exchange of units has not yet become a regular thing, a system of exchanging officers is already in working order since the institution of the Imperial General Staff. To-day this exchange of General Staff officers is necessarily somewhat limited, for the reason that there are

not enough in the Colonial forces yet trained as General Staff officers. Furthermore, to-day the greater part of the Colonial forces are made up of Militia and not Regular troops, so that officers sent from home could not be continuously employed. What is being done, however, is the sending of officers to the Overseas States from home, for General Staff duties, and in exchange attaching Colonial regimental officers to Imperial Regular battalions. In 1910 there were four New Zealand officers attached to Infantry regiments at home; this number will be replaced annually, in this way giving New Zealand in four years sixteen Imperial-trained regimental officers of its own. The War Office, in exchange for these regimental officers, will send to New Zealand two General Staff officers.

Exchanges between Australia and India are now also a *fait accompli*, and one or more Australian officers are at the Staff College at Quetta, in addition to those already attached to Indian regiments. In England, at the Staff College, several oversea officers have passed through, and in 1910 there were a Canadian, an Australian, and two South African officers at Camberley.

Before long the Imperial General Staff will have at Whitehall officers from the Overseas States who will have native knowledge of their respective dominions. They will be able to post the General Staff on all matters in their province, and will, in addition, have been "trained to think alike on all matters of principle." This is the keystone to an efficient General Staff. In 1910, for the first time, an officer of the New Zealand forces was placed in command of an Aldershot brigade, while an Imperial general officer took his place. In course of time, there will follow the creation of local staff colleges in the several dominions similar to Quetta and Camberley. Of course, it will be a considerable period before there can be a regular and extended exchange of Staff officers between the forces of the Empire generally, but a good foundation has been laid for this.

As to the auxiliary forces of the Empire under Federa-

tion, it would be well for them to remain under much the same local control as they are to-day. The Territorial Army of the United Kingdom should upon Federation pass under the jurisdiction of the Government of the United Kingdom, and be a charge on the funds of the local authorities. This would, in a measure, be similar to the method pursued in the American Union, that of having the Militia under State control, but under the supervision of the War Department. Legislation, however, has been lately introduced to bring the American Militia more under the direct supervision of the War Department in order to increase their efficiency. The idea is to have the Militia of each State commanded by an officer of the Regular Army. It is, therefore, to be regretted that the Canadian Militia Department has obtained the consent of the Imperial authorities whereby in the future the position of Inspector-General of the Militia shall not have to be given to an officer of the Imperial Army, holding the rank of a Brigadier-General, but to an officer of the Canadian Militia. It is realised by all military experts in the United States that the State Militia would be a far more efficient force were it under the command of an officer of the Regular Army. They sometimes point to the Canadian Militia as an example to be imitated because it is commanded by an officer of the Regular Army. And there is no doubt that the Canadian Militia, although far from being perfect, is, with but one or two exceptions, a far more efficient and soldierly body, with a higher morale and *esprit de corps*, than the American National Guard. It is, therefore, to be regretted that when the United States War Department is, owing to these considerations, endeavouring to move forward, the Canadian Militia is taking a backward step; for when once an officer of the Canadian Militia obtains the command he will be succeeded by his colleagues as surely as Amurath succeeded Amurath.

The recommendations of Lord Kitchener on behalf of Australia and New Zealand, Sir John French on behalf of Canada, and Lord Methuen for Africa, are being cor-

dially carried out by the Governments concerned. The several States are organising their Volunteer and Militia forces into local Territorial forces, and they will in principle become a part of the whole Territorial Army. This force would thus be divided into so many divisions at home and oversea, and may in time consist, as Lord Haldane suggested, of five or six divisions in Canada, five in Australia, four or five in South Africa, and one in New Zealand. The Territorial force in Canada, Australia, and South Africa, as a part of the whole Territorial Army, would be under the Imperial General Staff, but primarily under their local General Staffs, which would practically be branches of the central body at Whitehall, though under the control of the State Legislatures.

This foregoing plan would give us a truly Imperial Army of forty-six divisions as Lord Haldane ordains, making in all twenty-three Army corps. We would then have an Imperial Regular Army with its Reserve and Special Reserve, recruited from the Empire, and not only as now from the United Kingdom. This would be our first line or striking force. As our second line, primarily for local defence, we would have the Imperial Territorial Army, with divisions in the United Kingdom and the Overseas States. This force, however, trained and organised by the Imperial General Staff, would, if necessary, be capable of taking the field as a whole army, fully equipped in all its divisions.

It is to be hoped that something like the foregoing scheme may eventually be evolved, and the Empire, for the first time in its history, made impregnable in its defence.

Now, with regard to our regular troops, under such conditions of a true Imperial Army we would all feel sure of having an efficient force in all departments. With the introduction of some of the new and vigorous blood of our kin into our military departments, a great many necessary renovations would probably occur in our "system," and much that is now obsolete and antiquated in the War Office would be brushed aside.

At the same time, the more conservative methods and ideas from people at home would in turn check the sometimes too radical measures of our people overseas. Both these influences at work would prove beneficial to our military system.

At present the Empire keeps a force of over a million men at a great expense annually, which is rapidly increasing. In view of this it is appalling to note that many very necessary points of military efficiency have been sadly neglected. For instance, during the late war the scouting of the cavalry and the marksmanship of the infantry were found to be greatly in need of improvement. There is also much room for betterment in such branches as the Department of Intelligence and Strategy, the Army Service, Signalling and Ordnance Corps. Especially is this true of the Intelligence Department, which is responsible for mapping and being thoroughly conversant with the geographical peculiarities of the countries in which the Army might be supposed to have operations.

In these chapters, the defence of the British Empire has been reviewed. It has been contended that the naval and military forces of the Empire should be under the control of the Imperial Government; the various dangers and difficulties and folly of pursuing the opposite course have been pointed out. Whereas the one Government superintending the general and common interests of all, consolidating and directing the resources and powers of the units to a whole, would be freed from all embarrassments, and thereby better secure the safety of the Empire.

Whatever may be the position of the British Empire in the near future, whether firmly united and federated under a strong Imperial Government, or split up into a number of independent or semi-independent units, each striving to work out its own destiny selfishly apart from the others, it is certain that the conduct towards us of the nations will be shaped accordingly. If they see our defensive forces properly utilised and under the direction of an efficient Imperial Government, our resources,

commerce and finances properly developed, and the British people firmly united, the nations will be more desirous of promoting our friendship than of provoking our enmity. On an Imperial Federation with a proper system of Imperial Defence does the peace and happiness of the British race depend.

PART IV.

CHAPTER I.

IMPERIAL FINANCE AND TAXATION.

BY extending the British system of taxation to all the different provinces of the Empire inhabited by people of either British or European extraction, a much greater augmentation of revenue might be expected. This, however, could scarce perhaps be done consistently with the principles of the British Constitution, without admitting into the British Parliament, or, if you will, into the States-General of the British Empire, a fair and equal representation of all those different provinces, that of each province bearing the same proportion to the produce of its taxes, as the representation of Great Britain might bear to the produce of the taxes levied upon Great Britain. The private interest of many powerful individuals, the confirmed prejudice of great bodies of people, seem, indeed, at present, to oppose to so great a change such obstacles as it may be very difficult, perhaps altogether impossible, to surmount." So wrote Adam Smith, in his famous book, "An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations."

It is certainly worthy of our greatest consideration that a man so practical as Adam Smith undoubtedly was, should have given this question serious thought. The difficulties that in his day seemed to stand in the way of these ideas, have by modern inventions been now, to a great extent, removed.

It must be frankly admitted still by the friends of Federation, that perhaps the most difficult problem to solve in a plan for consolidating the British Empire, is

this question of Finance and Taxation. Similar plans, hitherto adopted by other great federations, cannot be accepted *in toto* by us, owing to the differences in geographical conditions. Yet the problem, though difficult, is not insuperable, nor will it operate to prevent the consummation of Imperial unity, thereby leading to Imperial disintegration. But in spite of this question being encompassed with difficulties, several plans have from time to time been suggested, which plans, subject to some modifications, can be said to be, in the main, practicable. Of course, the ideal method to pursue, and one which for years has received considerable attention from publicists, is to introduce an Imperial Zollverein, or Customs Union, for the whole British Empire, with uniform duties. This suggestion has been attacked and is considered by many impracticable, for reason that its duties would be the same in India as in England, the same in the North as in the South.

In regard to this question of taxation and revenue, the Imperial Federal Government ought to have the power of maintaining the Imperial forces. It must also be empowered to provide for the support of the Imperial Civil List; for the payment of the National Debt; and for any and all matters which would necessitate payment out of the Treasury of the Empire. If this must necessarily be, a general power of taxation of some kind or other must be engrafted into the machinery of government.

It is to be assumed that each country in the Federation would be called upon to contribute in some equitable measure, and in a manner as uniform as possible.

But it has been suggested by writers on this question that on federation the Imperial Government should undertake, as far as possible, the National Debt of the United Kingdom, and the debts of the Colonies, and in order to meet this the State Governments should be relieved from collecting the customs. But, even if this were done, the Imperial Government could hardly take upon itself the whole of the National and Colonial debts for some years, until such time as the customs receipts,

by increase of trade, were large enough to permit it to do so. Perhaps the thing to do would be to take up as much of the debt from each State as was possible until such time as the Imperial Government could relieve them of this, the remainder to be paid off by the local Governments.

But nevertheless the consolidation of the various debts into an Imperial Debt is a practical suggestion, even though it is encompassed by great difficulties, and such an undertaking would undoubtedly confer enormous benefits upon the several States individually and collectively upon the Empire as a whole. So far as the Oversea States are concerned, this would save them probably from twenty to twenty-five per cent. in their interest expenditure, which is a factor to be considered. To the United Kingdom it would assure Imperial unity and would give a certain amount of influence in the control of oversea expenditure, in return for a partnership in a guarantee of the debts, not of foreign Powers, but of the British Dominions. The Imperial Government in such a consolidation could rightly insist that in any proposed loan made by a State its soundness should be determined by the States as a whole, who would share in the responsibility of guaranteeing the same. Far from objections being maintained by a State to such an investigation, it is reasonable to suppose, on the contrary, that the people in the Oversea States would be glad of an extra investigation by an unprejudiced authority as a curb upon possible erratic financial schemes of their own Government. Assuming, however, that the State Governments would object to any sort of outside influence exerted over their expenditure, these objections would no doubt be overcome by the prospect of cheaper money which such a policy would undoubtedly entail. Pending the establishment of an Imperial Parliament, such matters should be reviewed by the Imperial Council or its Financial Committee. The States would thus be represented in these matters, and the case of any individual State would be properly inquired into. With a Financial Committee of the Imperial Council,

competition between the several Dominions in the money market, which to-day causes great expense, would cease. That these are grave difficulties to the attainment of this idea it would be foolish not to admit, but they are not insuperable.

Assuming, however, that such an amalgamation does not occur, it would nevertheless seem both fair and equitable that the several States should, in a measure, contribute towards that portion of the British National Debt incurred in the past for Imperial purposes—that portion of the debt to which they owe their present existence and British freedom to-day. The freedom of Canada from France, and the consequent guarantee of a British future for Canada, which that freedom gained, added a considerable item to the National Debt. The Spanish war of 1739 and the French war that followed, were principally undertaken on behalf of the Colonies, and made a large increase in the National Debt, which, according to Adam Smith, in his "Wealth of Nations," amounted to £78,293,313 1s. 10 $\frac{3}{4}$ d. In the war in which Canada became a part of the British Empire, Smith again estimates the cost: "On 5th January, 1763, at the conclusion of the peace, the funded debt amounted to £122,603,336 8s. 2 $\frac{1}{4}$ d. The unfunded debt has been stated at £13,927,589 2s. 7d. But the expense occasioned by the war did not end with the conclusion of the peace; so that, though on 5th January, 1764, the funded debt was increased (partly by a new loan and partly by funding a part of the unfunded debt) to £129,586,789 10s. 1 $\frac{3}{4}$ d., there still remained (according to the very well-informed author of 'Considerations on the Trade and Finances of Great Britain') an unfunded debt, which was brought to account in that and the following year, of £9,975,017 12s. 2 15-44d. In 1764, therefore, the public debt of Great Britain, funded and unfunded together, amounted, according to this author, to £139,516,807 2s. 4d."

Further on he thus comments: "The last war, which was undertaken altogether on account of the Colonies, cost Great Britain, it has already been observed,

upwards of ninety millions. The Spanish war of 1739 was principally undertaken on their account, in which, and in the French war that was the consequence of it, Great Britain spent upwards of forty millions, a great part of which ought justly to be charged to the Colonies. In those two wars the Colonies cost Great Britain much more than double the sum which the National Debt amounted to before the commencement of the first of them. Had it not been for those wars, that debt might, and probably would by this time, have been completely paid; and had it not been for the Colonies, the former of those wars might not, and the latter certainly would not, have been undertaken. It was because the Colonies were supposed to be provinces of the British Empire that this expense was laid out upon them."

Of course, a great part of this expense was incurred for what is now the United States; yet at the same time a great sum was incurred in the events preceding and following the affair of the Heights of Abraham, an affair which gained half a continent for the British race. The South African war, one of the most costly ever undertaken, has continued to show what great sacrifices the Mother Country will make on behalf of her daughter States; and it is to the credit and honour of South Africa that it recognised these sacrifices, and voluntarily agreed to take upon itself a portion of that financial burden incurred in its behalf. It may be urged to the contrary in this respect that those States which are concerned in this question should not take a share in the expense of this National Debt for reason that, at the time such expense for Imperial purposes was incurred, they were not represented in the Parliament of Great Britain, or later in the Imperial Parliament of Great Britain and Ireland. That in a strictly legal sense may be true, from the fact that as they had not the legal capacity of representation at the time these expenses were incurred they cannot be legally bound. Their position is then similar to minors, who are not legally bound on reaching their majority by the acts of their parents or trustees, though when those acts have proved

of benefit they morally should be. These States, then, likewise cannot be held for payment of the interest on the Imperial debt. The Mother Country can only rely on their realising that they are in a fair and equitable sense bound to their protector in the past. Should, therefore, they realise this, as it is to be hoped they will, in like manner it will be found that there have been occasions when some of these States have, in turn, incurred some expenses also for Imperial purposes for which they should also receive due credit.

It will be assumed, therefore, that upon Federation the National Debt would be apportioned among the several States, and become the funded debt of the British Empire.

What must then be considered is whether the Imperial Government would have control of a general power of taxation, or whether it should depend solely upon moneyed grants or quotas made by the different States. The second means is apt to be the more popular. But it is most improbable that this method could continue for long, and be the permanent system under Federation. The finances of the Empire should be under the control of the Imperial Parliament, which would be impossible if the Imperial Exchequer had to depend solely on grants made by the local legislatures.

In the case of a national necessity where the Imperial Government had to declare or prolong a war it would be within the power of a local Parliament to refuse further grants, if for the time dissatisfied with the policy, thereby seriously hampering the Imperial Government. Such a case happened in 1795 during the great struggle with France; when the Irish Parliament was called upon for money to carry on the war, they, instead of paying, passed a resolution advising the Parliament of Great Britain to make peace.

We should also be guided by what took place before the Constitution of the United States. It may be worth while, therefore, to read what Alexander Hamilton said on this question, he being undoubtedly the greatest authority, and one who probably did more than any

other man toward establishing the States in a firm Union: "The universal delinquency of the States during the war shall be passed over with a bare mention of it. The public embarrassments were a plausible apology for that delinquency, and it was hoped the peace would have produced greater punctuality. The experiment has disappointed that hope to a degree which confounds the least sanguine. A comparative view of the compliances of the several States for the last five years will furnish a striking result. During that period, as appears by a statement on our files, New Hampshire, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia have paid nothing. I say nothing, because the only actual payment is the trifling sum of \$7,000 by New Hampshire. Connecticut and Delaware have paid about one-third of their requisitions; Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Maryland about one-half; Virginia about three-fifths; Pennsylvania nearly all; and New York more than her quota."

It was chiefly owing to the energy and great statesmanship of Alexander Hamilton that induced a change for the better in the government of the United States, whose people at length perceived the necessity of having the power of taxation lodged in the National Government. In the same way the affairs of the Empire would have to be under the jurisdiction of the Supreme Parliament, and it would, therefore, have to have the means for carrying along the machinery of government.

The Imperial Government would have to provide for the support and upkeep of the Imperial forces. It would have to embrace a provision for the support of the Imperial Civil List, for the payment of the national debts, heretofore contracted, or which might be contracted. But it is extremely doubtful whether, under such conditions, the credit of the British Empire would stand very high if the Central Government had to rely on quotas and requisitions from the States as the only source of obtaining revenue. What nation would care to lend to a Government under such conditions when no great reliance could be placed on the method and

steadiness of its fulfilling its financial obligations? It is to be presumed also that, in spite of being the most opulent of nations, as in the past so in the future, we would have to borrow large sums to meet extraordinary expenditure.

The credit of the Imperial Government to-day is beyond question. It would be both disastrous and astonishing if, under a Federal system, the credit of the Imperial Government, which, naturally and logically, should become stronger than ever before, should meet the opposite extreme, and fall from its high pinnacle of greatness. Such would of necessity become the case were the Imperial Government to depend for funds upon the several local governments of the Empire. If, however, the Imperial Government was enabled to raise money directly, then that Government would be enabled to borrow on the credit of the British Empire as a corporate entity according to its needs. Alexander Hamilton, in *The Federalist* on 28th December, 1789, writing on this same question, which was then confronting the Americans in the framing of their Constitution, said: "Foreigners as well as the citizens of America could then reasonably repose confidence in its (the Federal Government) engagements; but to depend upon a Government that must itself depend upon thirteen other Governments for the means of fulfilling its contracts, when once its situation is clearly understood, would require a degree of credulity not often to be met with in the pecuniary transactions of mankind, and little reconcilable with the usual sharp-sighted avarice. Reflections of this kind may have trifling weight with men who hope to see realised in America the halcyon scenes of the poetic or fabulous age; but to those who believe we are likely to experience a common portion of the vicissitudes and calamities which have fallen to the lot of other nations, they must appear entitled to serious attention. Such men must behold the actual situation of their country with painful solicitude and deprecate the evils which ambition or revenge might with too much facility inflict upon it."

These are golden words of that great Englishman, and the position of the United States to-day bears the best testimony to his sagacity. It is to be hoped that when the time comes we also will take them at their full valuation, and will profit by what has occurred.

It seems plain, therefore, that the customs should be undertaken by the Imperial Government. This proposition, no doubt, would meet with a great amount of opposition in the different countries at first; but it is to be hoped that the majority would be brought to consider the necessity and wisdom of such a course. This same matter of control of customs by the National Government was in 1793 fiercely attacked by the people of the State of New York, but at length their patriotism overcame their opposition.

If the Imperial Government took over the customs and used the receipts for Imperial purposes it might be well, for a few years, to make a practice that those receipts in any country yielding over and above the amount due from it, the balance left, after paying the contribution to the credit of the Imperial Exchequer, should be handed over to the State Government.

In the event then of the States receiving only a portion of the customs dues, it would be necessary for those States which had derived heretofore from the customs their principal source of revenue to adopt other methods of raising revenue. More especially would this be so if, under Federation, the British Dominions maintained but revenue duties against the products of each other, though perhaps protective duties against the outside world. By this the revenue-producing power from the customs would be considerably curtailed, unless a policy of the strictest protection were adopted by each State against the foreigner.

There are several other modes that could be adopted to afford a revenue for local purposes. Chief among these may be mentioned an income tax or a house tax. In the United Kingdom the income tax has long been used as a means of internal revenue, the rate having varied considerably within the last few years. But

in regard to Canada this method of raising internal revenue by an income tax and so forth might be considered by some as detrimental to the economic welfare of the Dominion, for the United States does not at present use this as a method of raising revenue, and, therefore, it might be considered that with the adoption of such a tax in Canada it would place that country somewhat at a disadvantage to the United States from the point of view of immigration. But it is greatly to be doubted that the imposition of a slight tax on a person's income could possibly have such an effect, more especially if, under Federation, there was a system of emigration from the Mother Country, aided by the Imperial Government. Under those circumstances Canada would be in a much more advantageous position than the United States, and so could afford to frame her fiscal affairs with less regard to the methods of the United States than formerly. Besides this, by a proper system of preferential tariffs between the British Empire, discriminating substantially against the foreigner, it might influence the United States to enter into reciprocity with, or declare free trade to, the British Empire. If such became the case, the United States would very probably have to devise other means of taxation in order to make up for the loss of revenue occasioned by its policy towards us, and the Government of Canada would then have a freer hand in adopting new methods of taxation. Of course, the other Dominions not being in proximity to a great nation, such considerations would not interest them, or, at any rate, not in a great degree.

In the event of deficits occurring in the Imperial expenditure, the Imperial Parliament should have the power, if necessary, to assess the individual States in the proportion followed in raising the Imperial revenue. This would be somewhat similar to the practice followed in the German Empire, of assessing the individual States on a basis of population.

Should all the receipts of customs of the different States in the Federation be taken over by the Imperial

Government, it would be necessary on the part of the Government to reimburse those countries who had formerly derived their revenue from the customs. This could be done in the form of subsidies paid yearly to those States, following the practice adopted on Confederation by the Government of Canada, in giving subsidies to the various provinces forming the Dominion, in lieu of the customs receipts resigned by the provinces to the Dominion Government. This procedure has also been followed by the Australian Government.

It would, perhaps, prove of some interest to estimate in detail the probable amount of the Imperial expenditure of the Empire under Federation. It is believed that this has in the past been attempted, but the results of such attempts do not seem to have been very near the mark, the estimates having either been greatly in excess or insufficient to what might be considered the revenue or expenditure of the Imperial Government. This is a difficult question to work out. In general, however, the Imperial expenditure can be estimated in round numbers at about £84,000,000. This, however, does not include any payment of the interest on the National and Colonial debts—the funded debt of the Empire. When considered roughly, in detail it might be distributed thus :—

Imperial Army (exclusive of cost of Territorial Army of United Kingdom) ...	£30,000,000
Imperial Navy	42,000,000
Maintenance of the Crown	200,000
Customs	3,500,000
Salaries to Departments and to Members of Parliament	2,000,000
Diplomatic, Consular and Foreign services	2,000,000
Miscellaneous	4,000,000
Total	<hr/> £83,700,000

The practice now followed by Parliament is to support the Royal Family by the settlement of the Civil list, shortly after the commencement of each reign. It was

at one time the procedure for the Crown to derive hereditary revenues from land, excise duties, and other sources, in addition to revenues specially assigned by Parliament for the maintenance of the Royal household, as well as for the Civil administration of the kingdom generally. Parliament, however, exercised no direct control over the expenditure of this money, until the year 1760, when George III. surrendered the greater part of the hereditary revenues in England, in lieu of which he agreed to the payment of a Civil list of £800,000 per annum. During the succeeding reigns the Civil list has varied. By Act I. George V. c. 28, the Civil list of the King, after the usual surrender of hereditary revenues, is fixed at £470,000. It is, however, doubtful whether those States outside of the United Kingdom would agree to share in this mode of maintaining the Royal Family. It may be presumed that they would make no objection to a proper provision for the maintenance of the Crown, but they would very probably make such a provision only for services to the Empire, not for surrenders made by former sovereigns to that part of the British nation known as England, or the United Kingdom. They would, unlike the people of the United Kingdom, receive no benefits from such surrenders, and, therefore, would object to pay anything but an equitable amount to the Crown. The Sovereign, as Emperor of the British Empire, might then be provided for by fixed grants from the Imperial Parliament, and, as he would also be King of Great Britain and Ireland, would still receive the proceeds of the Civil list, paid by the Parliament of the United Kingdom, while the other States would continue paying their Governors their salaries, as they now do.

Under the item "Miscellaneous" would be included Imperial Supreme Court, emigration, subsidies to steamship companies, pensions, etc.

This question of expense is, no doubt, a great problem, and one which prevents many of our oversea compatriots from having a favourable view of an Imperial Federation. Yet it must be remembered that, were the

Dominions free and independent States, they would be at even considerably greater expense in each maintaining separate armaments than by taking a share in a common Imperial undertaking. Here they would undoubtedly gain the greatest efficiency at the least possible cost. Our Imperial expenses, though so large, have been rendered so by the action of the Powers, who have, of late years, increased their armaments at an enormous rate, and it has been a matter of vital necessity that we keep pace with them. However, the arbitration treaties between several of the nations may in the future permit of a great reduction in the cost of our armaments. Should this come about, it would take away the greater part of the necessity for Imperial expenditure, by reducing to the minimum the cost of Imperial defence. This would then leave a very moderate bill for Imperial necessities, relieve all from a great deal of taxation, and enable us to employ our energies in the pursuits of peace, for the better development of the communities and the nation at large, and to reducing the National Debt.

Many of the greatest minds in Europe and America fully realise the fearful annual waste of energy in maintaining the armaments of the Powers, and the severe drain thereby caused upon the resources of the nations. It may well be hoped that this twentieth century may see fresh efforts made to establish universal arbitration, which, although it may never establish universal peace, yet it will undoubtedly aid in very much reducing the possibility and frequency of wars; if not the abolition of armaments, at least a curtailment of their strength. May it be hoped that there will come forward others beside the Czar, with proposals of disarmament, and Mr. Andrew Carnegie, with an offer to build a tribunal for the nations, a Temple of Peace? However, until such things develop it is essential to our integrity as an Empire, surrounded, as we are, on all sides with the armaments of Europe, Asia and America, to be fully prepared for any eventuality.

Now, although the Imperial Parliament should pro-

perly have the power of taxation for Imperial purposes very broadly, it should, at the same time, devise a method of taxation least repugnant to the peoples of the Empire, more especially so in the beginning, to those who would contribute to the Imperial Exchequer for the first time in their existence. The ideal to be desired in this respect would be, if possible, to devise a means of taxation that would at the same time act in the double capacity of affording a good revenue, and in developing inter-Imperial trade by an exchange of products between all parts of the British Dominions; and by so doing create a strong sentiment supporting this policy, thus forcing upon the attention of all the great advantages and benefits derived from being in the British Empire. A Zollverein for the Empire, therefore, seems to meet the case.

CHAPTER II.

THE FISCAL POLICY OF THE EMPIRE.

PRACTICALLY the only expenses to which the peoples of the Empire would find it necessary to contribute in common would be those caused by their external relations with the rest of the world. As much as possible, then, should they derive their revenues at the expense of the nations who, by their existence as nations, render foreign attack probable.

The questions, then, of Free Trade, Preferential Trade, and Protection, now become to an extent involved. Of course the ultimate aim should be perfect Free Trade between all parts of the British Empire. So far back as 1775 Adam Smith, in his "Wealth of Nations," advocated this when, in discussing the question, he said :

"The trade between all the different parts of the British Empire would, in consequence of this uniformity in the Custom House laws, be as free as the coasting trade of Great Britain is at present. The British

Empire would thus afford within itself an immense internal market for every part of the produce of all its different provinces. So great an extension of market would soon compensate, both to Ireland and the plantations, all that they could suffer from the increase of the duties of the customs."

But Free Trade within the British Empire, in spite of the length of time since the days of Adam Smith, is not yet possible. The several parts of the Empire for some years will have to maintain duties against the products of one another as a means of revenue. But, upon Federation, if not before, it should be only as a means of revenue; more in the nature of excise, or octroi duties, rather than protective duties. To begin with, however, by a system of Preferential tariffs between the British Dominions, a substantial revenue could be raised, and such a system would enormously increase the area of inter-Imperial trade, founding thereby a colossal community of interest, such as minor inconveniences could in nowise attempt to destroy.

At the Imperial Conference, in London, in 1902, the subject of Imperial preferential trade was much discussed, and the following resolution was adopted by the Conference:—

" 1. That this Conference recognises that the principle of preferential trade between the United Kingdom and His Majesty's Dominions beyond the seas would stimulate and facilitate mutual commercial intercourse, and would, by promoting the development of the resources and industries of the several parts, strengthen the Empire.

" 2. That this Conference recognises that in the present circumstances of the Colonies, it is not practicable to adopt a general system of Free Trade, as between the Mother Country and the British Dominions beyond the seas.

" 3. That with a view, however, to promoting the increase of trade within the Empire, it is desirable that those Colonies which have not already adopted such a policy should, as far as their circumstances permit, give

substantial preferential treatment to the products and manufactures of the United Kingdom.

“ 4. That the Prime Ministers of the Colonies respectfully urge upon His Majesty’s Government the expediency of granting in the United Kingdom preferential treatment to the products and manufactures of the Colonies, either by exemption from or reduction of duties now or hereafter imposed.

“ 5. That the Prime Ministers present at the Conference undertake to submit to their respective Governments at the earliest opportunity the principle of the resolution, and to request them to take such measures as may be necessary to give effect to it.”

In 1907 this question of preferential trade was again before the Imperial Conference, and a very extended discussion ensued thereon. The Conference finally reaffirmed the resolutions made on this question in 1902, with the exception of His Majesty’s Imperial Government, which was unable to give its assent, so far as the United Kingdom was concerned.

From this it is seen that Free Trade within the British Empire is, at present, not considered within the range of practical politics. But nevertheless, by the institution of a system of mutual trade preferences between the British Dominions, the commercial unity of the Empire can be secured, and a full and complete Zollverein for the Empire foreshadowed. This question, with the exception of Imperial Defence, is one of the most important matters for the Empire to consider. At the root of all unity is self-interest. There are those who scoff at the idea of endeavouring to bind the Empire by what they characterise as a sordid bond of interest. But no community can be firmly united upon sentiment alone; it must necessarily be backed up by self-interest. The history of both ancient and modern times conclusively proves this to be a fact. The modern German Empire was united by the results of the Franco-German war; but the real cause of unity was further back than 1871. It lay in the founding of the Zollverein—the commercial Union of the Empire.

So in our case the establishment to-day of commercial union—of a Zollverein, would mean the adoption of a Kriegsverein to-morrow; both of which would foreshadow the political consolidation of the future.

This question of Imperial preferential trade unfortunately became involved with the purely local question of Protection for the United Kingdom, and was successfully postponed by the triumph of the Liberals at the polls in 1906, 1910, and in 1911. It is greatly to be regretted that the policy of Imperial Preference could not have been kept above party politics. Nevertheless, it is still before the British people, and will be until realised. Its delay should not cause those in its favour to be pessimistic; far from it; they should be optimistic.

It took originally years to convert the country to our present policy of Free Trade, and Cobden, after several years of political agitation, could count no more than a hundred and twenty followers in the House of Commons, and no doubt if the famine in Ireland had not occurred, or had Sir Robert Peel not been converted, the agitation of Cobden would never have materialised.

On the other hand, in the course of several years those in favour of Tariff Reform established a powerful association with branches throughout the kingdom, and a commission representative of the great industries at home and in the Colonies, which, after long deliberation, reported in its favour. Since the retirement of Mr. Chamberlain and Mr. Balfour, Mr. Bonar Law leads the Opposition, which is mostly in favour of this policy. They have the assistance of nearly all the great Unionist newspapers. Furthermore, Canada, New Zealand, South Africa, and Australia have, by their Imperial spirit in granting a British preference, greatly strengthened the position. And finally, the Congress of Chambers of Commerce of the British Empire have three times passed resolutions in favour of this by overwhelming majorities.

This policy is opposed by the Liberals on the ground that it infringed the doctrine of Free Trade. It is perhaps to be regretted that so many still worship, and cling to, a fetish, and apply the doctrine of Free Trade, in its most narrow form, to the great detriment of the economic advancement of the Empire. But do we now enjoy Free Trade, or have we ever done so? No! We have enjoyed, for half a century, a policy of free imports, but we have never enjoyed that Free Trade of which Bright and Cobden dreamed, and endeavoured to secure. Free Trade, by which we mean a free exchange of products between the nations, is one thing; but a hybrid system that protects the trade of the outside world, while giving no protection to our own, and allows other countries a policy of free imports, is another matter. Such a system certainly cannot be correctly called Free Trade, for there is no free exchange.

The Tariff Reform Commission on the iron and steel trade ascertained that, though this industry has been advancing rapidly in foreign countries, it has at home remained almost stationary. The imports have increased 200 per cent., and the exports have declined $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. This information was received from firms employing over 87 per cent. of the labour in the iron and steel trade. The Commission consulted the heads of the trade, and only 5 per cent. were content with the present so-called Free Trade Policy. Employers of 87 per cent. of the labour were convinced that neither masters nor men could expect proper conditions and fair play until we adopt retaliatory measures and meet tariff by tariff. The Commission also found that the relative decline of the iron and steel trade was not to be attributed to inferior skill and enterprise, either on the part of the manufacturers or the workmen, but was owing to the United States and Germany securing control of their domestic markets by the aid of high tariffs, and the regulation of their export trade. These countries are thus able to dump their surplus into England regardless of cost.

Protected countries enjoy superior facilities for

obtaining the maximum output and continuous running, and, thereby, dump their surplus products into open markets without loss, and, what is not generally supposed, with increased profit. The greater the quantity, the cheaper the product can be made. For instance, one manufacturer informed the Commissioners that he could make steel at £5 per ton when his works were running at their full capacity—to one thousand tons a week—but if only half his men were employed it would cost thirty-two shillings more. The conclusion to be drawn from all this is that iron and steel in England can only be produced at the lowest cost when the works are running at their utmost capacity. The result is that dumping is not an injurious policy to the dumpers, for reason that it enables foreign manufacturers to run their own works continuously, thus lowering the cost of production in both domestic and foreign markets. The Commission concluded by saying, “We find, therefore, that dumping is of the most wide-spread character, and may, contrary to the view held by many, be profitable to the country which practises it; that, unless checked, it is likely to remain one of the permanent incidents of trade; that it has already caused serious loss of employment and wages, diminished profits, and brought about a feeling of insecurity throughout the iron and steel industry; and that there are no advantages to the consumers of dumped products, which in the long run can compensate for lasting injury to the iron and steel industry.”

Conditions have altered. At the period of the introduction of Free Trade, the peace of Europe was still precarious; so much so that the Powers, in fact, had not been able to give attention towards the development of their commerce. England had, with increased prestige and power, also a short time before emerged from her great struggle with the first Napoleon. She was looked upon as the saviour of Europe from the Imperial yoke of France. The result was that, on the introduction of our policy, we enjoyed a somewhat unique position, in that we were practically devoid of commercial

rivals. The United States was then but indifferently known, and was later plunged into an internecine war to preserve the union, resulting in the greatest depression in financial affairs. Germany also, as we know her to-day, did not exist, but was split up into several impoverished States, belligerently inclined towards one another. France, therefore, was really the only country, at that period, which offered any competition at all.

But times and events have changed. To-day Germany is united. She is a prosperous and powerful Empire, with a rapidly increasing commerce, fostered by careful statesmanship. The America of to-day is, also, quite different. She is now to be counted a great world power, taking front rank among the nations. Her rapid increase in wealth and commerce is now the admiration and awe of the nations.

In the Free Trade of yesterday we enjoyed a commercial monopoly. The Free Trade of to-day sees that monopoly wrested from us by several powerful rivals, who are waging against us bitter competition. We have been in a fool's paradise, and are now somewhat rudely awakened from our Utopian dream, and are realising that if we do not take care we will, before long, lose control of both foreign and domestic markets.

It is due to the initiative of Canada that this doctrine has been brought within the range of practical politics, in creating the precedent, in 1897, of admitting manufactures of the Mother Country at 33 $\frac{1}{3}$ per cent. less than the goods of foreign nations. Prior to this time, British trade with Canada was fast declining, but, owing to the preference, the decline has been arrested, and British trade is now on the increase. Germany took umbrage at this policy, and denied the "most favoured nation treatment" to Canada. The Dominion retaliated by placing a surtax on German goods. This action of the German Empire was taken to prevent, if possible, the rest of the British Dominions following the example of Canada. It has developed, however, so that Germany hurt herself more than she did Canada. Moreover, Germany's action proved useless. **For the**

example has been followed by South Africa, New Zealand, and Australia in giving a British preference.

It is passing strange that a foreign nation should have sought to interfere in the trade relations of the several portions of the British Empire. It has long been the policy of nations having colonies and dependencies to maintain trade relations of mutual advantage with the same. The French Republic maintains a preferential policy with its colonies, and Spain long had preferential trade with her oversea possessions. It was our policy also, prior to the adoption of Free Trade, to have preferential relations with our possessions, and the propriety of such arrangements had never been questioned by the adoption of retaliatory measures on the part of foreign nations.

The trade policy recommended by the Tariff Reform Commission is as follows :—

First.—A general tariff consisting of a low scale of duties for foreign countries admitting British wares on fair terms.

Second.—A preferential tariff, lower than the general tariff, for the Colonies giving adequate preference to British manufactures, and framed to secure freer trade within the British Empire.

Third.—A maximum tariff consisting of comparatively higher duties, but subject to reduction by negotiation to the level of the general tariff.

The principal argument used against this policy is that it would involve a tax on food, but the duties to be placed upon corn would be equalised again by taking off or reducing the duties on other articles of general consumption. The extremely small duties on grain, imposed as a war tax in 1902, were at the time fiercely attacked, as they were supposed to at once raise considerably the price of the poor man's loaf. Statistics, however, show that the taxes yielded about £7,200,000 for the fiscal year of 1903, and caused no perceptible increase in the cost of bread to the consumer. It may also prove interesting to know, as a contradiction to those who maintain with great audacity that "Corn

Laws " make bread dear and that under Free Trade bread is always cheap, that during the last two hundred years we had two periods of extreme Protection and two of Free Trade; and the price of wheat in our markets was, for the most part, lower in the former than in the latter. From 1700 to 1765, under a high tariff, the price continued low and uniform, despite the fact that during a great part of that period England was engaged in war. In the year 1765 the " Corn Laws " were abolished, and the price of corn rose more than 36 per cent., and when we again engaged in war it rose to famine height. In 1815, Protection was re-established, and, singularly enough, the price began to decline, being in 1835 less than 40 per cent. of what it was in the former years of Free Trade. Again, in 1846, the " Corn Laws " were repealed, and, during the thirty years following, the average price of corn was more than two shillings a quarter higher than in the years before the repeal; while, during the Crimean War, the price rose to nearly double that of 1835. This, of course, does not mean that the relation between these changes in the tariff and in price has always been one of cause and effect; nor can it be properly demonstrated that whenever an increase of tariff is followed by an increase of price, or a lowering of the tariff is followed by a lowering of price, it is brought about by the law of cause and effect. It must be taken into consideration that there are other circumstances and conditions which may bring about an increase or decrease.

Assuming, however, that with a moderate duty on foreign corn, there would be a rise in price, it should be understood that such a rise would merely be temporary until such time as the Dominions were able to meet the deficiency in the supply of the Motherland. The grain areas of Manitoba and the Western Provinces of Canada alone are estimated by the Department of Agriculture at over 200,000,000 acres (four times the total cultivated area of the United Kingdom); but, for lack of people, there is only a small part of this vast area cultivated. The Editor of the *Corn Trade News*,

in a letter to the *Times*,* said that India's wheat shipment for that week not only exceeded that of the Argentina or Russian quota severally, but also the contributions of the United States and Canada combined. Moreover, we are now depending less and less on the United States for wheat. In 1902 the United States exported 64,000,000 bushels to the United Kingdom, but in 1903 the supply had fallen to 27,000,000, and was in 1904 only a little over 8,000,000 bushels. In 1903, for the first time, the British Dominions sent more wheat to the United Kingdom than the United States, the proportions being 31 per cent. for the Colonies against 27 per cent. for the United States; and this same year India sent in more wheat than any other country, and Australia more than the United States. Since then the increase of Colonial wheat and the consequent decrease of American wheat into England have been most marked. It is only a question of a few years when the United States will have to import wheat and other foodstuffs. We should, therefore, do all possible to develop the wheat resources of our own Dominions now.

With a certain amount of aid, in the shape of a preference in our markets, it would not be long before the 26,000,000 quarters of wheat, which the Mother Country annually requires, would soon be forthcoming from India, Canada, and Australia, thus making the British Empire independent of foreign aid for its bread supply. Similarly, there is no reason why the Dominions could not soon supply us with the meat we now obtain from foreign countries, amounting to very nearly £20,000,000 annually. Nor should the day be far off when our own people can send us the cotton that we now purchase from the foreigner to the amount of over £40,000,000 annually. Moreover, all this is urgently desired, in order to make us independent of foreign nations in time of war. It is never impossible that a great combination of powers might not declare food to be contraband of war and be able at the same time to uphold such a doctrine.

* August 26, 1904.

The policy of Preference would, in time, have far-reaching effects. It would develop the resources of the Dominions, and make Canada the granary of the Empire, and turn the tide of our emigration from the United States.

Besides Canada, there are parts of Australia and New Zealand that have large tracts of land suitable for the production of corn and the other grains, which, in the same way as Canada, need but the people to make the soil productive; an immense supply can also be derived from India. These communities must in course of time be opened up; the development may be slow, or of rapid growth; but should the people realise that their economic development was directly instituted, and carefully fostered by the Motherland, they would undoubtedly exhibit a wish, full of ardent patriotism, to maintain "British connection," and to share in partnership in the foreign policy of the Empire and in Imperial defence.

Our Imperial trade, owing to increase of population in the Dominions, should, in a few years, be as large, if not larger, and more important than trade with foreign nations, which year by year raise their tariff walls against us. To have an Imperial trade equal to our foreign trade would be a magnificent prospect before us. Thus, instead of the country annually pouring out millions of pounds sterling to foreign nations, as is now done, that money would go into Imperial channels, and not be lost, but would come back indirectly to us.

Under such conditions, and under a Federal system, our daughter States would be in a position to do their share in Imperial defence. Thus we would have an Empire self-supporting; an Empire such as never before existed, and one almost beyond the comprehension of mankind.

The adoption of a moderate tariff to-day would yield to the Imperial Exchequer a handsome revenue, and would allow considerable reduction in the income-tax and other direct taxes. Similarly, a moderate tariff

would give protection to British manufactures and prevent the United Kingdom from being deluged by trust-made goods, often sold below cost at the expense of British industries. It would also prove a boon to the landed proprietors, farmers and labourers, affording them an opportunity of producing food products at a paying price, thereby bringing the land and country estates back to something like their former value. For the depreciation in the value of land in the United Kingdom from the decay of agriculture is an enormous loss of wealth to the nation. In an editorial, the *Times* * thus comments on it :—

“ From a national point of view we doubt whether anything could compensate the expulsion of the population from the soil, and from an economic point of view it is absurd to reckon up the real or supposed advantages of our present fiscal system without facing the tremendous and indubitable loss accruing from the enormous depreciation of the land which is and must always remain, the most important of national assets. Six hundred thousand labourers have been driven off our fields in the last thirty years, and the capital of our farmers is estimated by authorities† who do not favour Mr. Chamberlain to have been diminished to the amount of £200,000,000. Putting out of account the mischief of driving the people off the land, this capital loss means, at 3 per cent., an annual loss of income of £6,000,000. Yet the smallest and most problematical loss that can be descried in any proposal for stopping this drain upon our resources is met with a howl of derision by people who imagine themselves to be the sagacious guardians of national prosperity.”

It has been estimated that 3,000,000 acres have been put out of cultivation. In 1852 Great Britain produced practically all the food it consumed. In 1910 it imported 75 per cent. of the food it consumed.

* August 5, 1904.

† Sir Robert Giffin.

In 1876 the yield of corn was 18,000,000 quarters, valued at £45,000,000; in 1910 the yield of corn was only 6,500,000 quarters, valued at £9,000,000.

This has been responsible for a great annual emigration, an emigration for the most part turned in the direction of the United States. And whatever may have been the real or fancied benefits to England under a policy of free imports, it must be admitted, even by the Cobdenites, that it has far from benefited Ireland, a country where one in five is occupied with agriculture. In 1841, under Protection, the population of Ireland was over 8,000,000. In 1901, after a period of sixty years of policy under free imports, the population has been reduced to nearly one-half, 4,500,000, when, allowing for normal increase, the population should be at least 12,000,000. It would seem, therefore, that the majority of the people in Ireland should be enthusiastic supporters of this Imperial policy, a policy which would do much for Ireland, and which should arrest the great exodus of her sons.

CHAPTER III.

THE FISCAL POLICY OF THE EMPIRE.

(Continued.)

UNDER the present commercial policy maintained by the United Kingdom we are devoid of weapons of defence. Britain is like a strong man bound in iron fetters who cannot strike back at his opponents. Year by year we see hostile tariffs raised higher and higher against our manufactures. Year by year our imports assume larger dimensions, while our exports to foreign countries have proportionately decreased. This may be seen by the following table, compiled by the Board of Trade officials. In

column A not only is coal deducted, but all articles which are not wholly or mainly manufactured.

A.—Exports of Articles wholly or mainly manu- factured in the United Kingdom to the principal Protected Foreign Countries, 1870-1910. Million £.		B.—Imports of Foreign Manufactures into the United Kingdom, 1870-1910. Million £.	
1870	80.7	52.5	
1880	81.9	76.4	
1890	87.2	89.9	
1900	80.3	128.3	
1910	72.1	135.2	

Thus it is seen that to all the principal countries the United Kingdom now exports a less amount of home manufactures than it did over thirty years ago. On the other hand, the imports into the United Kingdom of finished products in the same period have increased to enormous proportions.

These facts have so far been hidden by the increase in our exportation of manufactures to our own Dominions, as will be seen by the following figures.

TABLE SHOWING EXPORTS TO THE BRITISH DOMINIONS.

£		£	
1897	87,051,000	1904	120,783,000
1898	90,189,000	1905	122,713,000
1899	94,321,000	1906	130,647,000
1900	102,083,000	1907	147,454,000
1901	113,208,000	1908	135,667,000
1902	117,579,000	1909	137,872,000
1903	119,484,000	1910	147,318,000

That, so far as it goes, is a matter of congratulation. If everything we lose from the foreigner is made up in turn by our own people, that should prove satisfactory. But the question which we must consider is that proportionately, even in our own Dominions, the growth of foreign imports greatly exceeds the growth of the imports sent in from the United Kingdom. We are losing ground in places even where we thought we were strongest. British imports into Australia have

within the last fifteen years declined £2,200,000, though imports from foreign countries have increased £4,000,000.

These figures go far to indicate how important our Imperial trade is, and how essential that it should be fostered. The theory that "trade follows the flag" is certainly in our case correct. In 1911 the United Kingdom's exports were valued at £557,000,000. Of this great trade no less than £150,000,000 worth of goods were sent to the British Dominions, the balance of £407,000,000 being sent to foreign nations. Considering the comparatively small population of those British Dominions as compared with foreign nations, it can readily be seen that in proportion, or *per capita*, our Dominions buy much more from us than does the foreigner. The difference is something like £6 *per capita* for the Colonies and 6s. *per capita* for the foreigner. Then, too, our imports from the British Dominions were for the same year valued at £148,165,000. The principal Colonies send more products to the United Kingdom than to all the foreign countries put together. Canada finds a better market in the United Kingdom, and in 1911 sent £27,432,000, against £23,840,000 to the United States.

Another important matter to be noticed is that inter-Colonial trade is growing. In 1894 trade between the Colonies themselves only amounted to 15 per cent. of their total imports and exports; in 1904 it had increased to 20 per cent. Should not this valuable Imperial trade be kept and fostered? Should not steps be taken to arrest our losing ground, even in our own Dominions? In 1883 all Australia's European trade was done with the United Kingdom. In 1891 the increase of trade with the United Kingdom was 27 per cent., and with foreign countries 120 per cent. In 1910 the increase with the United Kingdom was 5 per cent., and with foreign countries 74 per cent.; during the last decade the imports from the foreigner into all our Dominions have increased 125 per cent., while British imports have only increased 75 per cent.

What must now be realised is that our supremacy in foreign trade is not in danger, but has already been lost. To-day the first country in foreign trade is Germany. In 1895 the exports from Germany were valued at £171,203,000; in 1905 they increased to £281,500,000, a growth in ten years of £110,297,000.

In 1871 the exports from the United States were valued at £90,000,000, the balance of trade then being £15,000,000 against the States; in 1901 exports from the United States were valued at £300,000,000—an increase in thirty years of £210,000,000, the balance of trade also having turned in favour of the States by £136,000,000. In 1871 the export trade of the United Kingdom was £283,573,000, the balance of trade being £47,442,000 against us. In 1901 it was £347,864,000, an increase in thirty years of £113,118,000, as against the increase of £210,000,000 for the United States. The balance of trade against the United Kingdom was £174,000,000; while the balance of trade was £136,000,000 in favour of the United States. Thus, while we made an increase in thirty years of £113,000,000, Germany in ten years made an increase of £110,000,000. America has, therefore, increased in trade nearly double as fast as the United Kingdom, and Germany nearly three times as fast. While we have crawled, Germany and America have made bounds.

The large yearly increase of excess of imports over exports is also ominous. America by the imposition of the Dingley tariff seriously affected British trade, causing large shrinkages in our tin-plate and a number of other industries. Before the imposition of the American tariff the British tin-plate export trade every year was increasing at a most rapid rate, doubling in fact in each successive ten years, until in 1892 it reached a total of 450,000 tons. Now, if it had continued to double every ten years, the exports should to-day be over 900,000 tons. But this could not be on account of the American tariff, behind whose walls a great tin-plate industry grew up, which to-day produces over 400,000 tons a year. Undoubtedly the

British tin-plate trade has again risen after its fall in consequence of the American tariff, but a great deal of this rise was due to the demand in South Africa during the late war, and to the increasing exports to the British Dominions generally. Even so, the total exports for 1902 only reached 370,000 tons, as against 450,000 ten years previously, a decrease of 80,000 tons.

Years ago Cecil Rhodes, the great Imperialist, had the foresight to see the effect of this policy. In 1890, just before his departure from Kimberley to Mashonaland, commenting on the parochialism of our statesmen, and roughly laying down his views on this question, he said :

“ Remembering that an assembly that is responsible for a fifth of the world has no time to discuss the questions raised by Dr. Tanner, or the important matter of Mr. O’Brien’s breeches, and that the labour question is an important matter, but that deeper than the labour question is the question of the market for the products of labour, and that, as the local consumption of England can only support about six millions, the balance depends on the trade of the world. That the world, with America in the forefront, is devising tariffs to boycott your manufactures, and that this is the supreme question, for I believe that England with fair play should manufacture for the world, and, being a Free Trader, I believe until the world comes to its senses you should declare war—I mean, a commercial war—with those who are trying to boycott your manufactures.”

How true was the prophecy of this letter the events of to-day show.

It has been urged by some opponents to measures of retaliation and Imperial preferential trade that such a policy might endanger our amicable relations with the United States ; also that America might retaliate by placing a heavy export duty on raw cotton, thus crippling one of our foremost industries. If these critics would read the Constitution of the United States,

they would perceive the folly of such an argument, as by Article 1, Sec. 9, of that instrument it is provided that no tax or duty shall be laid on any article exported from any State. But arguments such as these, even supposing them to be tenable, are hardly in accordance with our traditions as a nation. We have ever been ready to face the nations undaunted, and to-day, with proper weapons, we should be ready to face them in a commercial war, if they so desire it. Our people in Canada did not consider such arguments when they gave us a trade preference, though the great German Empire attempted to dictate to them. They replied by placing a surtax on German goods, and, as developments have shown, it was not Canada who got the worst of the fight. But, on the other hand, the peculiar results of the commercial policy of the United States has placed a great power in the hands of the British people. The United States has turned nearly half of its export trade into British channels. With the adoption of a British Zollverein levying a tax on the farming products of the United States, the profits of the American farmer would be considerably reduced.

Let us glance at the trade relations now existing between the United States and the British Empire. The exports of the United States during the fiscal year 1909 were over £327,671,000, the greater part being food products. Of this vast export trade no less than £148,000,000 went to the British Empire, the remaining £179,000,000 going to foreign countries. This is chiefly due to the fact that the United Kingdom maintains at present open markets to the world, and in the British dominions the tariffs are not high. On the other hand, by the prohibitory Dingley tariff, the onus of which is felt principally by Great Britain, our trade to the United States declined from £46,000,000 in 1890 to £33,000,000 in 1896. Since then it has again been on the increase, and for the first time, in 1903, it was again equal to what it was in 1890, thirteen years previous. From this one can easily understand the power possessed by the people of the British Empire.

We can use it in several ways. We can, if we wish, bring about reciprocity with the United States; we can also, by proper methods, stimulate the food products of Canada, Australasia, and India, thereby rendering ourselves ultimately independent of foreign sources of food-supply.

For several years past there was much talk in America of negotiating a reciprocity treaty with the Canadian Government to frustrate Imperial preferential trade. We in the United Kingdom had ample warning of this, and had not the Laurier administration been defeated on this question at the polls in 1911, reciprocity in natural products between Canada and the United States would have become established. This would have been but the thin end of the wedge and would likely before long have become extended as well to reciprocity in manufactures. Great Britain would then have found herself excluded from a North American Zollverein. The commercial effect upon the Empire should this policy ever become established will be bad, but the effect it will have politically will be graver still. Economically Canada would become a part of the United States; and it would only be a question of time when she would be completely weaned away from the Empire and probably enter the American Union. This would seem bound to happen whatever the upholders of reciprocity may say. It is not yet too late to frustrate these eventualities, but unless we act with some promptness it will be. The sentiment in Canada and the other dominions in favour of Imperial fiscal union may relapse and reciprocity treaties be entered into with foreign Powers.

Some years ago Sir Julius Vogel,* of New Zealand, advocated a Zollverein for the British Empire. He realised the great difficulties, but thought that they could be overcome by the imposition of a bounty of 10 per cent. on all goods produced in the British Dominions, on articles similar to those produced in the Mother Country—that is to say, he would give a bounty

* *The Nineteenth Century*, September 1893.

of 10 per cent. to the producers of wool, grain, butter, cheese, and meat in the Colonies. It was argued, however, that this was subsidising Colonial producers to compete with British farmers in their own markets. Sir Julius in this regard said: "It is fair to consider that they are prejudiced to the total extent of the bonuses paid on these articles, and we suggest that such payment should be made, the total amount to be divided among all the producers in such manner as may be found most satisfactory." He thought that the bounty would amount to over five and a-half millions at that time, and that it would increase to over £8,000,000. Two-thirds of this was to be paid by the United Kingdom, and one-third by the other British Dominions. He thought that this would eventually lead to Imperial Free Trade. He added: "We now come to the conditions which should accompany the agreement to make the payments recommended. We suggest as follows:—

"1. The British Possessions agree to impose an extra *ad valorem* import duty of 10 per cent. on all foreign commodities of the same character as those imported from the United Kingdom.

"2. Any of the bonuses described shall cease to be paid six months after the United Kingdom declares a 10 per cent. differential duty on any of the commodities, subject to such bonuses coming from foreign countries. Thus, for example, whenever the increased production of the British Possessions made it safe to place a 10 per cent. duty on grain from foreign countries, the proposed bonus on grain would cease.

"3. On three years' notice (issued not sooner than seven years from the date of the bonuses coming into operation and not later than eighteen years), the United Kingdom will impose not less than a 10 per cent. duty on all foreign commodities, the British Possessions and the United Kingdom will agree to an exchange, free of customs duties, of all commodities of their own production or manufacture. The British Possessions are also to impose a duty on foreign commodities of not less than 10 per cent., but to be at liberty as well as the

United Kingdom, to make the duty on foreign commodities larger than 10 per cent.

“With these exceptions, if any, within twenty-one years—probably much earlier—there would be a complete Zollverein within the British Dominions. It may be added that the various customs departments would have no difficulty whatever in carrying out the details of the scheme.

“It cannot be denied that, as far as the United Kingdom is concerned, these provisions will confer prodigious benefits. They will largely increase the demand for the manufactures of the Mother Country; they will give an impetus to British trade and British shipping, at a time when both are threatened by the increasing hostility of foreign countries. The power to go beyond the 10 per cent. duties will be a formidable weapon in the way of repressing foreign unfriendliness—a weapon, the want of which the ablest statesmen have lamented.”

This scheme advocated by Sir Julius Vogel seems more or less practical, and might be possible of eventual adoption subject to some alterations.

Lord Rosebery, in a speech on Imperial Federation in 1888, said: “You cannot obtain the great boon of a powerful Empire encircling the globe with a bond of commercial unity and peace without some sacrifice on your part.” Lord Rosebery’s present attitude towards Imperial preferential trade, therefore, seems in strange contrast to his sentiments in 1888.

It is questionable, under the circumstances, whether the people of the United Kingdom would suffer great inconvenience by the introduction of a tariff to protect home industries from unfair foreign competition. It is more than likely that such a tariff would soon have the opposite effect. The large army of unemployed now in the Kingdom, is greatly owing to free imports. The products of America and Germany, dumped into the country, often below cost, are the main cause of lack of employment, and of starvation for British subjects. A tariff would, in time, check this, and bring back employment to many willing but unfortunate workers, and at wages conducive to a decent existence.

It would be well to briefly discuss the event of preferential trade being adopted. It is to be presumed that the Dominions will still retain entire freedom over their tariffs, in regard to foreign countries, and will still be able to enter into commercial treaties with them, with the consent of the Crown. It would be well to insert in the statute authorising the commercial union, that each Dominion or dependency has the option of entering or not entering the Union. The non-entry of any Dominion or dependency will debar it of the privileges of free trade, or preferential trade, with the United Kingdom, and the other British Dominions, and will place it in the same position, commercially, with a foreign State.

Upon the political federation of the Empire its Federal Parliament could frame a general tariff, raising and lowering the duties on foreign imports, to suit local conditions; though the principle should be that inter-Imperial trade should be free, with a few exceptions, on which small duties might still be maintained, as a means of revenue. In other words, inter-Imperial trade should be considered as the coasting trade of the British Empire. Perhaps, to begin with, it would be better policy for the several States to frame their own tariffs in regard to the duties that each might desire to impose upon foreign imports, though, as here stated, they should not impose protective duties upon imports from the British Dominions, nor discriminate in any way against any of them in favour of a foreign nation. With the consent of the Crown, a State could have the power of entering into commercial treaties, extending to a foreign State, the same privileges as open to the British Dominions, in exchange for equal privileges in the markets of that foreign State.

What would be the most advisable and attended with the best results, if practicable, would be to eventually introduce a Zollverein for the Federation. The Zollverein might, or might not, include the Crown Colonies and dependencies of the Empire, which would not be in the status of States, though it would be more advisable, if practicable, to include all. Then the whole

British world would be drawn into the firmest bonds of union and sympathy. This would establish a far greater Free-Trade area than that of the United States of America, which is, in one sense of the word, the greatest Free-Trade nation existing to-day, having Free Trade throughout its States and Territories.

What a power the British people hold in their hands ! It lies with them to do this great work. What of the other nations that are now gaining such commercial success at our expense ? What effect will this have on them, when every dot on the map coloured red has free entry into the British Zollverein ? Such a policy will greatly affect America, Germany, and Russia—in fact, the world. They would then be in the same position as the United Kingdom is in their markets without such policy. If there is ever to be universal Free Trade, then its existence will depend upon the British Empire.

Let us, therefore, work for Imperial Free Trade ; for the time when trade will be as unhampered between Canada and the United Kingdom as the trade between the State of New York and California. When that shall come to pass the trade of the British Empire will be beyond the conception of man. But before this realisation the British people at home and in the Dominions must become strongly united, must realise themselves and act as one homogeneous nation—be, in fact, the British Commonwealth, made up of a union of States—the United States of the Britannic Empire.

CHAPTER IV.

IMPERIAL STATE AID TO EMIGRATION.

It may be true that the Mother Country of this great Empire is crowded, but, in order to relieve the pressure, it is not necessary for us, as if we were Goths or Turkomans, to seize upon the territory of our neighbours ; it is not necessary even to incur great risks, or undergo great hardships ; it is only necessary to take possession of boundless territories in Canada, South Africa, and Australia, where already our language is spoken. If there is pauperism in Wiltshire and

Dorsetshire, this is but complementary to unowned wealth in Australia. On the one side there are men without property, on the other there is property waiting for men. And yet we do not allow these facts to come together in our minds, but brood anxiously, and almost despairingly, over the problem of pauperism, and when Colonies are mentioned we ask, What is the good of Colonies? (*The Expansion of England*, by Sir John Seeley).

Almost the most important question for an Imperial Government under a Federation of the Empire to consider should be the problem of Emigration and Immigration. It should become an absolute duty for the Government to consider the means and advisability of transferring a section of the people, willing to emigrate, from congested districts within the Empire to the uncongested, diverting thereby the outflow from foreign into Imperial channels, and thus increasing the population in those States where the need was felt to the great advance of the national wealth. Under Federation the farmer in Natal would be as much a citizen of the Empire as the farmer in Sussex. By no argument could an individual upon emigrating from the United Kingdom to another Imperial State then be considered an economic loss to the Mother Country from the point of view of contributing to the Imperial revenue.

But this question, far from being confined only to Federation, is practicable and vitally essential for to-day. Unemployment in the heart of the Empire has for years been growing. It is now upon us in an aggravated form, and likely to continue with increased severity. No amount of private and public charity can solve the problem, which bristles with greater difficulties year by year. And yet the country is said to be wonderfully prosperous. Nothing short of Government intervention will meet the position. Some persons pin their faith to a redistribution of the land. A back-to-the-land policy, they say, is the only chance. That it is a sensible movement cannot be denied, but it is doubtful, with the annual increase of population, whether any back-to-the-land scheme will have even an appreciable effect, much less solve the problem.

The only effectual way of coping with the situation is to establish a scheme of Imperial State-aided emigration. And it should not be beyond the powers of the Home and Colonial Governments to devise a plan of co-ordination whereby the surplus population of the United Kingdom should be able to migrate to Canada, Australia, and South Africa, provided, of course, these persons would make suitable and desirable subjects of our Colonial Empire. The advantages of such a course would be manifold. Not only should we lessen overcrowding in the United Kingdom, but the migration would of necessity turn many persons who are now consumers into producers, thus the burden now cast upon the Motherland of supporting annually a large number of persons in idleness would be proportionately reduced. These emigrants, too, instead of being a loss, as some contend, would mean so much gain to the national wealth. They would develop the great agricultural resources of the Dominions and supply the Mother Country with the food she now must get from foreign countries. Thus would the Empire be made self-sustaining. Then in the future when Imperial unity is realised, these people, many of whom were burdens to their community, would, as prosperous citizens, contribute and greatly augment the Imperial revenue.

State-aided emigration is by no means a new theme. The transference of a portion of our population to the British Colonies was to some extent carried out before Queen Victoria ascended the throne. As far back as 1826 a Select Committee of the House of Commons was appointed to deal with the question of encouraging emigration to the British Dominions. From their report it appears that the rapid increase in the population of the United Kingdom had caused much destitution and suffering among a portion of the population; it had lowered the standard of living, and had an injurious effect on the general condition of the working classes. And if this was the case in 1826, when the population was only twenty-four millions, how much more is it true to-day when the population is nearly fifty millions?

The Committee reported in favour of a system of assisted emigration, urging that "the national wealth will be increased by the change if the Colonies are to be considered integral parts of the nation at large," a statement worthy of the progressive Imperialism of to-day. Acting on the Committee's recommendations, the Government appointed Commissioners of Emigration, and gave serious attention towards directing our surplus population to the Colonies. Government pamphlets were published and distributed among the masses, setting forth the advantages to be gained in the Colonies and giving general information regarding them. Under this systematic policy British emigration to the Colonies from 1825 to 1840 amounted to 89,185. In 1847 no less than 109,680 people went to Canada, and in 1852, on the discovery of gold in Australia, emigration rose from some 16,000 to 87,881.

In 1830 the National Colonisation Society was founded, chiefly through the influence of Mr. Edward Gibbon Wakefield. Hence arose what became known as the Wakefield System, by which a cash payment was imposed on emigrants for every acre of land alienated belonging to the Crown, and a tax levied on the rent of the land thus acquired, the proceeds going to a fund employed in transferring emigrants to the Colonies at Government expense. This plan was advanced to replace the policy which gave free grants of land to every immigrant who, on arrival, proceeded to take possession of the land, thus becoming a landowner devoid of capital, a policy which had the effect of making labour scarce, so that both capital and labour became unemployed. In 1836 a Select Committee was appointed to consider the question of lands in the Colonies belonging to the Crown. Mr. Wakefield gave evidence before this Committee, and their report recommended that his proposals be adopted in the Colonies. Later on the general principles of Mr. Wakefield's proposals were accepted by Parliament. The slow transportation of those days greatly handicapped State aid to emigration, but with the modern methods of ocean travelling this would no longer be the case. Yet, in spite

of all difficulties, during the first half of the last century over a million British emigrants sailed for the Colonies.

The introduction of Free Trade brought about what may be termed a fiscal revolution in the British Empire, and with the disappearance of preferential rates the Colonies began to be regarded as incumbrances to the Mother Country. Many believed that Free Trade would become universal, and therefore nothing was to be gained by keeping a Colonial Empire, while with the Colonies independent their markets would still be open not only to British trade, but to the trade of the world. In the end the Wakefield system was abandoned and all Government control of emigration withdrawn. Opinion, however, to-day is very different. The idea of wishing for the disintegration of the Empire no longer prevails, and therefore the moment is opportune for entering upon a mutual emigration and immigration policy that will tend to the Empire's development and strength.

So far back as the days of Elizabeth, Sir Humphrey Gilbert, half-brother of Sir Walter Raleigh, in his "Discourse"* to prove a passage by the North-West of Cathay and the East Indies, proposed to colonise the North American coasts with English settlers.

We might inhabit (he said) some part of those countries, and settle there such needy people of our country which now trouble the Commonwealth, and, through want here at home, are enforced to commit outrageous offences, whereby they are daily consumed with the gallows. Thus we shall increase both our ships and mariners without burdening the State, and also have occasion to set poor men's children to learn handicrafts, and thereby to make trifles and such like which the Indians and those people do so much esteem; by reason whereof there should be no occasion to have our country combred with loiterers, vagabonds, and such idle persons.

Thus Sir Humphrey was the first to put forth the idea that Colonies would be of great advantage to

* Published in 1586, and subsequently included in *Hakluyt's Voyages*, vol. iii.

English commerce, and that the relief occasioned by emigration to the Colonies would result in a decrease of pauperism in England.

Again, in 1890, pressure was brought to bear on the Home Government to inquire into the question of facilitating emigration to the British Colonies, the result being the appointment of "The Select Committee on Colonisation." The Committee in its report embodied the following points as necessary to any scheme of colonisation :—

The formation of a Colonisation Board, with Imperial and Colonial representation; capital to be raised by public subscription to a "Colonisation Land Rent-Charge Stock," carrying interest at three per cent. per annum, to be guaranteed by the Imperial Government for a term of thirty years, preference to be given to colonists who contribute towards outlay; colonists after second year to pay four per cent. on amount advanced, secured by a rent-charge, with or without an extra one per cent. for contingencies; rent-charge to be redeemed by colonists within thirty years; Colonial Governments to give land free, or on the most favourable terms for settlement, with power to create a rent-charge where necessary.

To establish and carry out to-day a system of Imperial State-aided emigration would require a heavy annual expenditure on the part of the Home Government, but it is reasonable to suppose that in any well-considered scheme the Colonial Governments would co-operate. Nor should the pregnant words of John Stuart Mill be forgotten, that "colonisation is the very best business in which the capital of an old and wealthy country can possibly engage." It is unwise to minimise the difficulties attending a joint scheme of State-aided emigration, but nevertheless such a scheme can be devised and successfully carried out. The following points are suggested for consideration for present-day conditions.

The Home and Colonial Governments to jointly subsidise several vessels as transports for emigrants. Persons desiring to emigrate to apply to the Agents-General or High Commissioners, as the case may be,

for passage, who would, of course, require satisfactory evidence as to suitability. The Home Government to loan a sum to the several State Governments, who would guarantee repayment with interest after a specified period, the State Governments, on their part, to provide so many acres of free land, and, in addition, to advance a sum of money (say, £200), in four yearly instalments of £50, to each settler, taking a mortgage on the land and improvements until repayment of the loan with interest. This would be good and sufficient security, as in the majority of cases the permanent improvements on the land would more than cover the amount of the loan.

If intending emigrants knew that in the British Dominions land awaited them, together with £200 capital with which to start farming, and that they would receive a free passage on a Government vessel to their destination, there is little doubt that they would sooner go to the Dominions and remain under the flag than pay steerage to the United States and have no employment in view on arrival. The money, too, would be a wise investment on the part of the Home Government, for it would develop the oversea States and keep our own people within the Empire. Moreover, by building up the Empire we shall bring nearer the day of Imperial federation. The Argentine Republic found it to their advantage to advance money at 5 per cent. interest to the settlers, the principal to be repaid at the end of ten years. By this means the Republic obtained in six years an immigration of nearly 1,200,000 persons and an investment of \$750,000,000. On this side, of course, it would be necessary to establish a Department of Emigration to supervise the scheme and publish such information as might be necessary. Such a department should be linked with the recently constituted Labour Exchanges.

Owing to the policy—or, rather, the want of policy—pursued by the Home Government, by far the largest stream of our emigrants has been turned towards the United States. The statistics of emigration for 1902

show that from 1852 to 1902, a period of fifty years, the total number of emigrants who left the United Kingdom was 9,242,133, their destinations being : United States, 6,098,144; British North America, 962,642; Australasia 1,446,152; British South Africa and other places, 715,195. It will, therefore, be seen that while the United Kingdom sent 6,098,144, or nearly as many persons as the present population of Canada, to develop and enrich a foreign nation, only 3,143,989 left our shores for other parts of the British Empire, and in this calculation I have assumed that the "other places" are in the British Dominions.

Writing on "Ireland's Financial Burden" * Lord Dunraven says :—

The decrease in the population of Ireland is one of the most remarkable social facts in the modern history of the world. Nearly four million people in sixty years, about ninety per cent. of them in the prime of life, have fled from Ireland, and those who have remained appear to have done so of necessity rather than of choice.

The greater part of these four millions found a home in the United States. This is a tremendous gift from one nation to another, but the benefit does not end here. It is the general practice to value these emigrants at \$1,000 (£200) per head. Accepting this estimate, we have, then, a total gift of \$6,098,144,000, or £1,219,628,800 made to a foreign Power in fifty years, representing a grant in aid of £24,392,576 a year. In these conditions it is hardly surprising that the growth and prosperity of the United States should be what it is. In less than half a century that country has risen from a comparatively unknown land to be the second greatest Power in the world. And though Englishmen may be justified in feeling proud of the brilliant career of a nation founded by themselves, and which, up to 1783, formed an integral part of the British Empire, yet surely our first duty is to those who did not separate from the flag, but remained with us when the foremost

* See *Nineteenth Century and After*, July 1905.

Powers of Europe were combining to cause our downfall. We have expended many millions on a South African war, and on campaigns in Somaliland, Egypt, and Thibet, on expeditions into Afghanistan or campaigns on our North-West Frontier of India, and on Zulu and Kaffir wars. Could but a fraction of this enormous cost have been expended in directing our people to our Dominions, the whole British Empire would have been the gainer. The monetary value of those six millions of British people, had they remained under the flag, would have been used to increase the strength, power, and wealth of the British Empire. It is more than probable that if the Colonies had seen that their rapid development was a great deal directly owing to the Mother Country they would, owing to their increase in wealth, have before now become anxious to have taken their equitable share in Imperial defence. If British statesmen in the past, therefore, had put forth all their energies to develop the United States as a competitor against us, they could not have succeeded better.

James G. Blaine, the American Secretary of State, some years ago said to the British Minister:—

“Why do you allow your emigrants to come to the States? Do you know that in ten years this emigration will more than double itself? What are your Colonies doing? Why don't you guide your emigrants' steps where they will be of use to your own country?”

If those in authority had only taken Blaine's advice the British Empire to-day might have been a self-sustaining entity. It is useless, however, to dwell upon what might have been. Let us, rather, seek to profit from the experience of the past. As Sir Wilfrid Laurier has observed: “If the nineteenth century belonged to America then this twentieth century shall belong to Canada.” The tide of emigration is beginning to turn to Canada. Several hundred thousands of American farmers from the Western States have since 1900 crossed into Canada. They are composed of the best elements that go to build up a country. But it is to be hoped that the North-West of Canada will

receive a goodly number of settlers from the British Isles in order to counteract the tendency towards its Americanisation. It is to be regretted that even to-day, when the Dominions are taking such a prominent part in our daily life, so many of our people turn their faces towards the United States. One meets young Britishers of good families in responsible positions in all the great cities of American industry. These are the young men our States need. The Far West of America is also plentifully sprinkled with our countrymen. It is true that many of them live and die without changing their allegiance, yet their labours go towards building up the great Republic, and not the British Empire.

Those who do emigrate are composed generally of the flower of our people, the industrious and alert, their less ambitious kindred being content to remain behind, often merely existing, huddled together in the narrow back streets of our great cities, where the sun never penetrates, and characterised by Tennyson as the "warrens of the poor." The result is that physical deterioration among the masses has set in, and is now causing the country grave concern. This is a most important and vital question to the whole Empire.

According to Sir Frederick Maurice, out of every five men who, during the late war, endeavoured to enlist, at the end of two years only two remained out of every five as effective soldiers. If this is so, then it means that 60 per cent. of the population from which the rank and file of our Army is drawn are in a state of physical unfitness for Army life.

The reports of the Inspector-General of Recruiting show that the recruits are to-day smaller, lighter, and more narrow-chested than in 1870, 1880, or 1890. In 1845 the standard of height in the Infantry was five feet six inches. In 1872 it was lowered to five feet five inches; in 1883 to five feet three inches; in 1897 to five feet two inches; and in 1901 specials were enlisted as low as five feet.

As far back as 1891 the Census showed that there were in London 174,500 tenement-houses that consisted

of only one room. Of these more than 29,000 held three persons, over 16,000 held four, over 7,000 held five, over 2,500 held six, over 850 held seven, over 250 held eight, and others holding each nine, ten, eleven, twelve, or more. These figures are quoted from Mr. Charles Booth. This was in 1892. Since then conditions have become infinitely more appalling, because of the ever-increasing exodus from the agricultural districts to the towns, and also because of the undesirable immigration from the Continent, which is making England a dumping-ground for Europe.

In 1907 there were over 124,000 recognised paupers in London receiving Poor-Law relief, and that number is not decreasing. In 1905, on the 29th January, the inspectors and medical officials of the London County Council took a census of London's outcasts. Between one o'clock and five o'clock in the morning, from Hyde Park to Whitechapel, and from Holborn to the Thames, 1,609 men and 188 women were counted in the streets without a place to sleep. Since then conditions have become worse.

It was estimated by Mr. Jack London, in his book, "The People of the Abyss" (a work that should be read by all Englishmen who love their country), that 21 per cent. of the people in London are driven to take parish relief. Also that 1,800,000 persons were either utterly destitute or living on the brink; one person in every four in London died supported by public charity. With a population, then, of 42,000,000 people there were 8,000,000 always liable to starvation, and 20,000,000 not being able to live a really healthy, clean, and comfortable life. As it is with London, so it is with the other large cities, York, Liverpool, Bristol, and Edinburgh. It seems almost impossible that conditions can be so bad in the heart of the richest and most powerful Empire in the world. This deterioration is an Imperial danger and is of as vital interest to the rest of the Empire as to the people of the United Kingdom.

This physical deterioration among the masses is due to several causes, one being the excessive consumption

of alcoholic drinks, which is one of the chief sources of revenue which the Government depend upon to provide for the maintenance of the United Services for the Imperial defence. It is also due to the frightful overcrowding, as seen in the foregoing statistics, in unhealthy quarters in the large cities, consequent on the depopulation of the country districts. Seventy-seven per cent. of the people live in cities; the proportion in Germany being but 36 per cent. This is mainly due to the downfall of agriculture, caused by the policy of Free Trade, or, rather, free imports, as well as to the great difficulty of obtaining employment. Even when employment is obtained it is often only at starvation wages, caused by the terrible congestion in the labour market, which has of late years appeared in a most aggravated form. The only hope of curing the disease is in Government aid and supervision of emigration to the Dominions. The Salvation Army has already begun an admirable undertaking. In 1904 this organisation started by carrying over one thousand people from England to Canada. These people were not left in Quebec to their own resources, but were taken in small parties to different parts of the country where they were needed. Every one of the party had a situation waiting for him. Soon the Salvation Army will be able to carry many thousands, not only to Canada but to all the Colonies. If such an undertaking can be made a success by the Salvation Army, it surely could be adopted by the Government.

For years our working people have, through the great competition between steamship lines, been offered facilities to emigrate to the United States. Many at home have consoled themselves with the idea that this would increase British exports to that country. But it is now well known that the British Dominions are much better customers to manufacturers of the United Kingdom than either the United States or foreign nations. Our own people take from us £6 per head, the foreigner 6s. It follows, therefore, that it is of the greatest importance for the United Kingdom to en-

deavour to increase the population of the Dominions in order to gain a still greater trade with them. We are becoming more and more dependent for food and manufactures on foreign countries. When all this is considered one marvels at the indifference of the Government to emigration, and the absence of any attempt to direct the exodus that does take place towards our own Dominions. Such disregard of Imperial interests must eventually end in the loss of those very countries which, if fully populated by British emigrants, could make the Empire self-sustaining and create magnificent markets for our own manufactures.

Look, too, at the effect of our *laissez-faire* policy on the poor of the United Kingdom. Some, no doubt, that are unemployed are unemployable, but the greater number would, if given the chance, willingly go to work. In 1910 the total number of paupers in the United Kingdom was 1,158,000, and the cost of maintaining them was £17,588,000. This sum, when capitalised at 3 per cent., represents a capital of over £600,000,000. Nor do we stop at this enormous expenditure; large sums are annually contributed to charitable institutions, which keep numbers of people practically in idleness. Many of these pensioners, State and otherwise, are able-bodied, and if given the chance to emigrate to another part of the Empire would become producers as well as consumers. Thus not only would a great part of this huge outlay be saved, but there would be an actual gain to the wealth of the Empire.

It must not be supposed from these remarks that one wishes to see the Home and Colonial Governments adopt a joint system to transfer paupers wholesale from the United Kingdom to other parts of the Empire, although it is probable that some prejudiced critics will at once fasten one with this intention. But what one should emphasise is that if a joint system of State-aided emigration were inaugurated which directed our emigration to the thinly-populated British Dominions, it would reduce the large surplus population here within bounds, tend considerably to reduce the number of people depen-

dent on charity, and help on the development of our great Empire.

Emigration is one of the most important of our Imperial questions. Upon it depends the health and physique of future generations. With the federation of the Empire all these emigrants, far from losing their nationality, would become more than ever before a gain to the British nation, contributing, as they then would, to all Imperial necessities, having, as they then would have, a common citizenship, with equal political rights, realising also the privileges enjoyed as citizens of the British Empire. It is greatly to be hoped, therefore, that the statesmen of the Empire, profiting by the past, may eventually arrive at some successful conclusion in dealing with this question. The alternative to this is that the United Kingdom may continue to pursue her indifferent course towards the emigration of her sons, and that, as in the past so in the future, many of our best, the flower of our manhood, will go to swell the ranks of the army of workers in the United States, our greatest rival now and in the future, or possibly develop and carve out independent nations from the States of an unfederated British Empire.

CHAPTER V.

PRACTICAL IMPERIALISM.

THE consolidation of the British Empire will probably be realised gradually. For if we continue the policy of what may be termed practical Imperialism, the consolidation will rather be a process of evolution than revolution—a slow but steady growth towards Imperial unity, though perhaps in some respects, as treated in a previous chapter, certain phases in our political system will be said to become revolutionised.

The many important details of practical Imperialism, if gradually carried out, would pave the way to federation. As mentioned before, the present quadrennial Imperial Conference should be superseded by a per-

manent Imperial Council, consisting of his Majesty's advisers from Home, the Dominions, and India.

The Council could then deliberate on, and advocate, the following programme of practical Imperialism :—

1. The adoption of an Imperial code of identical laws upon naturalisation, patents, copyrights, weights and measures, etc.

2. The creation of some scheme of State-aid to Emigration.

3. The establishment of some sort of commercial union, probably begun by preferential trade, between the several units of the Empire.

4. Increased contributions of ships, men, and money from self-governing States towards Imperial Defence.

5. The establishment of fast lines of steamships between Canada, Australia, South Africa, and the United Kingdom, convertible into auxiliary cruisers in time of war; to be subsidised conjointly by the Imperial and State Governments.

6. Further increased postal facilities for newspapers and magazines.

7. The creation of an Imperial commercial bureau, probably connected with the Imperial Institute, to obtain and send out information concerning the trade and commerce of the Empire and foreign countries, to endeavour by various means to obtain closer and better commercial relations between the countries of the Empire, to have its headquarters in London, and branches throughout the British dominions.

8. The laying down of some general standard applicable to the conferring of degrees from the universities of the Empire, and in the same way to provide qualifications in the several learned professions.

9. The reform of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council; or the establishment of an Imperial Supreme Court to take its place.

10. The uniformity in some branches of statute law, especially commercial law, dealing with merchant shipping, etc.

11. Uniformity of Imperial cable rates.

Perhaps one of the most important details of practical Imperialism would be the improvement in the communications between the several parts of the Empire by subsidising fast steamship lines. At present there is much to be desired. It is astonishing when properly considered in respect to one example alone to think that there is still such an inadequate steamship service maintained between Great Britain and Canada. For the position of Canada from the geographical standpoint is more advantageous than the United States. The distance between Galway in Ireland, and Halifax in Nova Scotia is a third less than that between Liverpool and New York. These two ports are situated almost opposite to one another, and at practically the narrowest part of the Atlantic. This route also would be free from ice all the year round, and would, therefore, allow very great speed in safety. It has been estimated that nearly 80 per cent. of Canada's mails and passengers at present come and go by way of the United States, although the Dominion Government gives a subsidy to a Canadian mail service to do this business by way of the St. Lawrence in summer, and Halifax in winter.

The result is that the United States has grown in wealth and trade at the expense of Canada, which is, in territory and natural resources, the equal of the United States in every respect. This also is one of the chief causes of the idea held by many in the United Kingdom, who should know better, that Canada is a vast wilderness covered continually with ice and snow. It is about time, therefore, that his Majesty's Governments in Great Britain and Canada subsidised a bi-weekly service, between those ports, of fast Atlantic liners making the trip in four to five days. In time of war these vessels could be used by the Admiralty either as transports or auxiliary cruisers. A further saving of time could be effected if a terminus were established on some part of the eastern coast of Newfoundland; then the mails and passengers could be transported across the island by train. This might then reduce the ocean-crossing to three days.

Lord Brassey, in an article in the *Nineteenth Century* on "Our Naval Strength and Naval Estimates," referring to the discussion of an Anglo-Canadian fast service at the Montreal Congress, said :—

If established by an Imperial subsidy we should be giving our Colonial fellow-subjects a helping hand in an undertaking they have at heart, while adding to the list of vessels available as the scouts of the Navy. On similar grounds it seems desirable that the mail service to Australia should be maintained by an Imperial subsidy, under conditions which would insure that the ships should be held at the disposal of the Admiralty. The speed should be accelerated. The Imperial-Colonial Mail Service would be a practical training for engineers, officers, and stokers of the Navy and Royal Navy Reserve.

This is of great importance to both Great Britain and Canada, as well as to the Empire as a whole, for such a policy would bring the East and Great Britain into closer communication, creating a great Imperial highway for both commerce and the transportation of troops. And this should not only be done in the case of Canada, but as much as practicable between all the British Dominions.

From Canada there could be two other fast lines, one from Halifax to the West Indies and the other from Vancouver to New Zealand and Australia. By binding Australia to the Straits Settlements, the Straits Settlements to India, India *via* Mauritius to South Africa, and each in turn, by the shortest passage, to England, a great Imperial system of quick transportation would be obtained without a parallel in the world's history. And by the speed and efficiency of those Imperial ocean greyhounds would the links of Empire be bound and its great inter-Imperial commerce enhanced.

This question was extensively discussed and a resolution in its favour was adopted by the Imperial Conference in 1907; but, although communications subsequently passed between the Governments concerned, the idea has apparently for the time being been abandoned.

Not long ago it was suggested by Sir George Sydenham Clarke that a small revenue duty should be imposed

upon all foreign imports entering the British Dominions. His proposal was that the proceeds from this duty should be used to subsidise and develop the different means of communication within the Empire. This idea should certainly be urged by the Imperial Conference.

The question of maintaining and improving our merchant marine is a fit subject for practical Imperialism. It is with great apprehension that all thinking people should view the rapidly decreasing number of British sailors in our merchant ships and the consequent increase in the number of foreigners. We cannot and do not wish to go back to the Navigation Acts in their entirety, for they fettered Colonial trade to a great extent. But we know from Adam Smith that during their existence two great objects were attained—the supremacy of the British Empire on the sea, and the extension of its commerce. It would be entirely practical to adopt to-day some of the details of that system—namely, in regard to providing that every British ship must have a certain proportion of British subjects as sailors. Of late years we have been subjected to competition by other nations in regard to our merchant marine, and although our marine is in a satisfactory state of increase, yet the foreign increase has been greater. In 1880 the total tonnage of our merchant marine amounted to 8,447,000 tons; in 1890 it had increased to 9,688,000, in 1900 to 10,751,000, and in 1903 to 11,831,000—an increase from 12.8 per cent. to 16.2 per cent. On the other hand, the combined foreign tonnage rose from 8,312,000 tons in 1880 to 8,497,000 in 1890, or 2.2 per cent., and from 8,497,000 in 1890 to 11,136,000 in 1902, or 23.6 per cent. We have suffered greatly by the reservation of the coasting trade of the nations to their own ships. There is no reason why we should not protect ourselves in this, and make reprisals by agreeing to reserve for the ships of all our Dominions the coasting trade of the British Empire. This is a matter of pressing importance, and should be considered by the Imperial Conference.

There are besides this many other projects that would,

if realised, act as important factors in leading toward Imperial unity. One is the bringing of cable lines and wireless telegraphy to a system of joint control by his Majesty's Governments of Great Britain and Ireland, Canada, Australia and South Africa, and thereupon lowering the rates between these several Dominions.

Sir Sandford Fleming, who has already achieved so much for the communications of the Empire, describes the proposed system of Empire cables thus :

“ First, from the United Kingdom to the Pacific, embracing a cable across the Atlantic and land lines through Canada.

“ Second, a cable across the Pacific from Canada to New Zealand and Australia, with land lines through Australia to the Indian Ocean.

“ Third, a cable from Australia across the Indian Ocean to South Africa, with a branch from Cocos Island to India.

“ Fourth, a cable from Cape Town to the United Kingdom, *via* Ascension, the West Indies, and Bermudas, with a branch to Canada.”

This all-British system laid in the deepest seas would be a great factor in the strategy of Imperial defence and in fostering commercial relations.

A most important matter is that the Press in the Dominions should derive its news from British sources, and not obtain it filtered through American channels, as has been long done by Canadian newspapers. The injurious effect is great, as a vast amount of such news is received from anti-British sources, and is doctored accordingly. It would be a most progressive scheme if the newspapers of the Empire should hold a meeting and combine to establish an Imperial associated Press agency, independent of the present news organisations, and have this great combine transmit news to and from all parts of the Empire, and, if possible, at lower rates than the foreign Press news bureaus. Such a scheme would bring all parts into more active touch with one another, and its importance cannot be over-

estimated when we realise the power of the Press in this twentieth century.

Equally as important is the reduction in the rate of postage on British newspapers and periodicals from home to the Dominions and from the Dominions to home. This would facilitate the exchange of periodicals, which from every standpoint is to be desired. At present Canada, at any rate, is flooded with American magazines and newspapers. Many of these, it is sadly to be regretted, are still anti-British in sentiment, in spite of the cordial relations which exist between the two nations and which certainly obtain among the educated and cultured classes in the United States. Publications from England are even now, in spite of the recent arrangement with the Post Office, for the most part conspicuous by their absence.

It is impossible that Canada can remain a British Dominion if American and not British literature prevails in the country. Increase in trade must be stimulated by the exchange of newspapers and periodicals between Canada and other parts of the Empire. To-day, Canada is more familiar with American politics and commercial methods than those of the Motherland.

This condition of affairs is partly the fault of the Imperial and Canadian postal authorities. At the postal convention of 1875 between the United States and Canada it was agreed that letters, newspapers, and periodicals should be carried at the domestic rates without any accounting between the two countries. Consequently, the American can send his newspaper or magazine into Canada at the same rate as he would send it to another part of his own country.

The late Mr. Seddon, the great Imperialist and able Premier of New Zealand, urged the establishment of a British commercial bureau with branches in all our Dominions, maintained by Great Britain and the self-governing States, and with the President of the Board of Trade at the head. His idea is that the Board be affiliated with Colonial Chambers of Commerce with the special object of watching and reporting on the trade

requirements in manufactured goods, and, in fact, all the products of the Empire. It should also assist in the extension of British and Colonial markets by keeping the British Dominions continually informed in regard to competition with foreign countries. This certainly is to be counted among the many subjects of practical Imperialism suitable for immediate adoption.

One of the most important questions, perhaps the most important of any, that should be in this class, is the provision for Imperial education. This has been sadly neglected; it is, in fact, hardly provided for at all.

Imperial education is instilling into the minds of the young a proper knowledge of the British Empire—a knowledge of its history, its material growth and expansion, its geography, its wealth, resources, great possibilities, and economic questions. It is perhaps astonishing to have to confess that but little of these most essential matters are provided for, even in the greatest of the educational institutions of the Empire. Much unnecessary and humiliating ignorance of one another exist among the people in the Empire's several parts. At home the greatest want of knowledge among the masses, in this regard, lies on the geographical side, and in Greater Britain, on the historical side, though neither are confined in their ignorance to these two respective details. Many in Canada have but a vague idea of Australia and *vice versa*. This is owing partly to distance, but increase in trade and speed in communication are overcoming that objection, and by Imperial education it should soon be completely overcome.

Too much attention is devoted in schools to matters of local interest. This, in a degree, is to be commended, but it can be easily carried to excess. A good deal more time is devoted to acquiring a knowledge of foreign nations, in which portions of our own Empire are occasionally included. In other words, in our text books on geography, for instance, we do not endeavour to teach the geography of the British Empire as a whole. We learn, on the contrary, about the United Kingdom, India, Canada, Australia, and so forth,

interspersed with countries such as France, Germany, Russia and the United States, arranged in order according to the continents and groups in which they lie. This from a purely geographical standpoint seems only natural, but at the same time it would be far better to consider the British Empire as a single political entity. This is done in regard to the United States, learning as we do the geography of those states collectively and not separately. We learn the geography of the United States, and not the geography of Pennsylvania, California, New York, and so on, interspersed with foreign countries. Of course, the argument in answer to that is that the United States as to territory is compact and the British Empire is not. That, so far as outsiders are concerned, is worthy of consideration, and foreign text-books on geography will probably continue to do as is now done.

In the case of British text-books on geography this could be altered. The first part of the book could be devoted to the British Empire, in which could be learned the geography of its several parts. For it is considered always more necessary to learn about the geography of our own country first, before gaining a knowledge of foreign countries. The words "our own country" should not be construed, therefore, in their most narrow form, but should be construed to mean the British Empire—to mean all countries under the common flag. A geographical knowledge of the Empire is far more important, and should have precedence over geographical knowledge of foreign countries. Of course, there are those who will say that hours devoted to the study of geography in schools are limited, and that little or no time would be able to be devoted to the geography of foreign countries. But, even so, far better that the children attending our national schools should know little of Germany, France and Russia than to be ignorant of the magnificent resources of Canada, Australasia, and South Africa.

The British Empire, which is established in every

portion of the world, may be considered a world in itself. Why not, therefore, a special text-book for this world—the British world? If not a special book, let the first part of the text-book deal with the countries of the Empire, and the second part with the great countries of the world, and according, if you will, to their natural geographical positions. Failing a new text-book, the headmasters of the schools throughout the Empire might teach their pupils the Empire first, leaving the information as to foreign countries to follow after.

A great deal to increase patriotism and a knowledge of the Empire can be done by the aid of history—our Imperial history. It should consider those events in the past that were, and are, the direct cause of our great Imperial heritage. In the evening schools of our cities these subjects could be dealt with in a more advanced and extensive form, and instructors could treat on some of the great economic questions with which the Empire is concerned. By a proper and careful method of Imperial education, patriotism and a great interest by the people in one another in the different parts of the Empire can be stimulated. This can be still further helped by “Imperial travel.”

It was the custom in the early days of the last century for young gentlemen in Great Britain and Ireland to make what was known as the “Grand Tour,” to spend a year or more in travelling on the Continent of Europe. This was considered essential, as being part of a gentleman’s education. Would it not, therefore, be good policy to revive the “Grand Tour” at the beginning of this twentieth century, and to make it the completion of a young man’s education to tour the British Empire and also the United States? A knowledge of India, the Colonies, and the United States is just now as necessary, if not far more so, than a fine knowledge of Europe was in the old days. This should be essential to those who have hopes of a political career. For the greatness of England is not found alone in England, but in the British Empire, and moreover in the United

States. The greatness of the United States is, however, in America. As one of our poets most truly said :

“ Little they know of England
Who only England know.”

A splendid precedent was created by the late Mr. Cecil Rhodes when he left practically the whole of his vast fortune in order to found a number of scholarships at Oxford for our fellow countrymen from the Colonies, our cousins from the United States, and our Teutonic neighbours from Germany. It is, perhaps, to be regretted that these scholarships were not all given to the Colonies. However, the precedent has been created, and it is to be hoped that in the near future those of wealth among the Imperial-minded may follow in the footsteps of that great Empire builder, and will found more scholarships at our ancient Universities for young men from the Colonies, many of whom will play a part in making the future history of the Empire.

In *The Empire Review* for June 1904 a letter to the Editor entitled “ Proposed Sequel to the Rhodes Scholarships,” written by Mr. W. E. Stopford of Brisbane, suggested that in order to afford an opportunity for young men from the Colonies to visit the home of their ancestors, and at the same time not to neglect their education, “ the Universities of Oxford, Cambridge, Melbourne and Sydney might find in the mutual chartering of University boats and the appointment of travelling tutors a popular idea.”

If this be practicable, as it seems to be, it would be a most sensible and progressive policy for the students of those Universities concerned, and would be a means of adopting an Imperial tour, taking the place of the “ Grand Tour ” of old. It would permit young men from home to see the Dominions and gain a practical knowledge of them, while at the same time continuing their studies ; it would also permit young men from the Oversea States to see England, and be brought into active contact with her institutions. Such an idea

should be taken up and given serious consideration by the faculties of the Universities throughout the Empire. Imperial travel and education, if fostered, will have a great and progressive effect on the Empire. It is only those who have travelled through the Empire who can fully realise its vastness and power, and appreciate the doctrine of Imperial unity. Only those who have had the privilege of hearing the strains of the National Anthem and "Rule Britannia" sung with an intensity and zeal by men and women of our race in countries under the Union Jack, several thousand miles away from home, and sung with a spirit that we do not always hear in the British Isles, can fully appreciate the greatness and significance of this British Empire. One must be utterly lacking in sentiment and imagination who after wide travel failed to do so. And this is equally the case of the Briton who has never visited the home of his fathers, or seen any other part of this vast Empire but the particular spot in which he has always lived. To those, then, who have not had Imperial travel, it is often difficult fully to appreciate this noble doctrine. One is often apt to have old-time prejudices and to be hampered by musty precedents which are liable to clash in an inquiry of the subject. Imperial travel tends to do away with these prejudices by broadening our minds and forcing us to see things as they are.

Travel to-day is comparatively inexpensive to what it used to be, and the average well-to-do Englishman can visit the Colonies, and the Colonial has also the opportunity to visit, at least once, the two little islands that so many still call "Home." Yet the bulk of the people at Home and in the Dominions will never have an opportunity to visit one another, and it is to them and their children that a thorough knowledge of Imperial education should be imparted.

Education in this century is one of the greatest forces with which to reckon. Therefore, enlist it on the side of Imperial unity. Imperial education can do probably more than anything else towards helping the idea to

become reality. And the proper authorities, realising this, should provide the different schools throughout the Empire with Imperial education as a part of their regular curriculum.

In conclusion, last but not least among the many subjects for practical Imperialism is to make the British Empire independent of its cotton supply from foreign countries. This is a question vital to the commercial interests of the United Kingdom, more especially to Lancashire, and has been too long neglected. As far back as the sixties the folly of relying on the foreigner was demonstrated to us in the American Civil War, when our supply from that source was practically cut off. This caused untold misery and loss to the manufacturers and wage earners of Lancashire. In 1904 we were again at the mercy of the United States through the unscrupulous jobbery of American speculators. Mr. J. A. Hutton, vice-Chairman of the British Cotton Growing Association, on August 22nd of that year read a paper before the British Association in which he detailed the praiseworthy efforts of the Association to relieve Great Britain from her dependence upon the United States for raw cotton. He said that the short time on which our factories were then running was not entirely due to a shortage of cotton, but was really greatly owing to the serious aggravation of the difficulty by numerous speculators. Mr. Hutton estimated that no less than 10,000,000 people in England were more or less dependent upon the cotton trade. The employees alone were losing £40,000 a week through working on short time, and the total loss to both capital and labour throughout the country was not less than £300,000 per week, or £15,000,000 per annum.

The British Cotton Growing Association have within the last few years carried on a most splendid campaign for the welfare of the Empire. They have proved conclusively that by assistance the British Empire in time could grow enough cotton for its own needs. The West Indies, East Africa, Uganda, West Africa, South Africa and Queensland are all suitable communities for grow-

ing cotton. This would be a splendid field for patriotic and enterprising British capitalists. It is not too much to expect that the Imperial Government to-day should devote some grants-in-aid towards fostering this new Imperial industry.

By carrying out these various suggestions to-day a most beneficent effect would be exerted upon the Empire. They should one and all be considered as stepping-stones to Imperial unity.

CHAPTER VI.

THE DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR SERVICES AND OTHER IMPERIAL MATTERS.

IN considering this question of Empire governance in all its phases, a chapter has treated on each of the more important details which would go to make up the Imperial Federal Constitution. It will be the purpose of this short chapter to touch briefly on the several other questions which would be concerned in such a union.

To begin with, the Indian, Diplomatic, Foreign, and Consular services would, of course, be under the jurisdiction of the Imperial Government, and these services would then be accessible to the young men of the Empire, and not practically only, as is now the case, to those residing in the United Kingdom. Examinations for these branches of the Imperial Civil Service should not then only be held at the Imperial capital, London, but also in the capitals of the several States. This would permit young men to prepare and pass their examinations without having to go to the expense of coming to London, until at least they had successfully qualified.

But this should be inaugurated to-day and not left until the establishment of a federal system. It may be argued that as the Oversea States to-day do not support

the Diplomatic and Consular services financially, we should not help them to join the services when we have so many at home desirous of entering. But if we persist in this course it will not be long before we are met with a similar situation recently faced by Sweden, by some of our Dominions demanding the right to each have their own Consular service. The result of those demands may mean, as with Sweden and Norway, a dissolution of the union. This is a question that should be above pounds, shillings, and pence. Let us look at it from a broad and Imperial viewpoint. By enabling young men from the Dominions to enter the services by establishing examination boards in their cities, more interest would be taken in the Imperial service, and eventually the people would see the wisdom and justice of contributing to it. It would be wise policy sometimes to offer to those in the States who are worthy the position of his Britannic Majesty's representative at some foreign Court. It would be a compliment to a distinguished statesman of the Empire and to the Dominion from whence he came. This, then, would be one of the many great advantages of Federation, that people in the Oversea States would have open to them, and within easy reach, all positions in the Imperial service, either civil, naval, or military.

Upon the union of England and Scotland the peerage of the two countries became united under the title of "The Peerage of Great Britain." Later, in 1801, upon the union of the Kingdoms of Great Britain and Ireland, the peerage of Great Britain and Ireland became united under the title of "The Peerage of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland." Peerages, though derived prior to the dates of the two Acts of Union, remained separate. Upon the federation of the Empire it would be well to create a Peerage of the British Empire, which might or might not incorporate the Peerage of the United Kingdom. It would probably, however, be more advisable to keep the two peerages distinct, reserving the bestowal of an Imperial Peerage for the recognition of services rendered to the Empire.

As to whether these peerages should become hereditary or given merely for life, that is a question, of course, not necessary here to determine, though it would seem better to follow the ancient custom and continue in a measure the bestowal of hereditary peerages. For it is well known that a man fired with the ambition of obtaining honour and distinction works more with the thought of obtaining it as an inheritance for his son and family than for his own personal enjoyment.

It would also be advisable, though not absolutely essential, that upon, or soon after, federation, the Imperial Parliament should legislate for an Imperial and uniform coinage, to be in use, at any rate, in the States, if not in all the dependencies. At present the pound sterling is in use in the Mother Country and most of the Colonies, though the decimal system is in vogue in Canada, and the rupee in India. It is every year becoming more apparent to those who favour progress that the decimal system is greatly superior to the pound sterling. Its simplicity is unequalled by any other system, so that it would seem advisable to eventually adopt the decimal system as the basis of an Imperial coinage. It would also be good policy to make weights and measures uniform by adopting the metric system. This is one of the many things that should be carried out to-day. Indeed, a resolution to this effect was made at the Imperial Conference in 1902, in the following words :—

“ That it is advisable to adopt the metric system of weights and measures for use in the Empire. And the Prime Ministers urge the Governments represented at this Conference to give consideration to the question of its early adoption.”

In regard to the question of copyright and patents, it would be very necessary that they be made uniform, or, at least, that some plan be established for their mutual protection. A resolution on this question was also passed by the Imperial Conference of 1902 :—

“ That it would tend to the encouragement of inventions if some system for the mutual protection of patents

in the various parts of the Empire could be devised. That the Secretary of State be asked to enter into communication with the several Governments in the first instance and invite their suggestions to this end."

It might also in the end prove advisable to codify some of the more important laws regarding naturalisation, marriage, and divorce, and certain laws relating to crime, into an Imperial Code. In regard to the first—naturalisation—that should be enacted even to-day, and, in any case, upon the formation of an Imperial Constitution.

CHAPTER VII. CONCLUSION.

IT has been the purpose of the preceding chapters upon the problem of Empire Governance to show that the whole question of Imperial unity is really one of the deepest practical moment, and far from being only considered a theory. We have tried to set forth a general plan for the eventual adoption of an Imperial Federal Constitution. It has been shown, too, that aside from reasons of sentiment Imperial unity should certainly continue. We have, in the main, community of race, community of defence, community of religion, of laws, political institutions, a common literature, and, by our commerce, a gigantic community of interests, which, by proper means, can be made even greater. If the conditions of the empires of the past, and of some of the present, are analysed, it will be realised that few, and very few, had a greater community of interests than we. In many the bonds that held were more artificial than natural, and in many there was no such thing as a "community of race." Take, for instance, even two present-day empires—those of Austria and Russia. In both there exists the great differences of nationality, the Russian population

being estimated as made up of 110 nationalities. Now the countries of the British Empire which would be embraced in the Federation on an equality as States are in the main British. Of course, there are the French in Canada, and the Dutch and coloured population in South Africa. But these differences are becoming less every year. The French population, though large and prolific, must eventually become merged in that of the English by natural increases and immigration. So that, as compared with other empires, the British Empire can be said to have community of race.

But objections have been raised to the fact that the people oversea are not quite the same as the people at home. Of course that is to an extent true. The Australian is not quite like the Englishman at home; nor is the Canadian. But such differences are always to be expected in large communities, and are simply owing to local conditions. These differences exist even in the United States, the Westerner being easily distinguished from the Easterner, and, again, the Southerner from the Northerner. They have always existed even in such a compact State as France; and, indeed, such differences obtain not only in the United Kingdom, but even in the counties of England. Therefore, so far from being an objection, on the contrary, the coming together of many from our daughter-States and our people at home would have a beneficial effect upon all. For the more "go-ahead" notions of our kin overseas would have some influence upon the more conservative of us in the United Kingdom, and, in turn, our conservatism would tend to have an influence upon the somewhat radical notions of our oversea compatriots. These two influences at work would in time, therefore, exert a good influence on both.

If the history of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries is studied it will show that the British Empire is really the last of a family of empires, and the only one remaining that has really extensive world-wide dominion, such as was the case with the former empires. The empires of France, Holland, Portugal, and Spain

are now as visions of the past, though France still has extensive colonial possessions, and Holland still enjoys the prosperous dependency of Java. Germany, also, of late years has endeavoured to become a colonial Power, but, up to the present, with poor success. It is somewhat peculiar to note that the British Empire, of all these empires, was the first to founder. But from the ashes of the old arose up a new and yet greater Empire. And this is really the last remaining of that coterie of empires which had great possessions in America, Africa, and Asia.

Now, the question for the British race to decide is whether they will continue to form an Empire, or to follow the example of their predecessors—Spain, France, Holland, and Portugal. It has been strenuously urged that we keep intact this great heritage for reasons of sentiment and patriotism, even though our material interests toward one another may not demand it. A great deal, on the other hand, has been urged that sentiment should not enter into the question. What should be considered is whether it would not be better for us again to become the United Kingdom, an entity in the northern sea; for it is believed by many that a small State is preferable to a large one. It is shown that the large States in the past have been of a lower organisation than those of smaller magnitude.

“But observe,” Sir John Seeley wrote, “that a small State among small States is one thing and a small State among large States quite another. Nothing is more delightful than to read of the bright days of Athens and Florence, but those bright days only lasted so long as the States were on a similar scale of magnitude. Both States sank at once as large country States of consolidated strength grew up in their neighbourhood. The lustre of Athens grew pale as soon as Macedonia rose, and Charles V. speedily brought to an end the great days of Florence. Now if it be true that a larger type of State than any hitherto known is springing up in the world, is not this a serious consideration for those States which rise only to the old level of magnitude?”

Russia already presses somewhat heavily on Central Europe ; what will she do when, with her vast territory and population, she equals Germany in intelligence and organisation, when all her railways are made, her people educated, and her Government settled on a solid basis? And let us remember that if we allow her half a century to make so much progress, her population will at the end of that time be not 80,000,000 but nearly 160,000,000. At that time, which many here present may live to see, Russia and the United States will surpass in power the States now called great as much as the great country States of the sixteenth century surpassed Florence. Is not this a serious consideration, and is it not especially so for a State like England, which has at the present moment the choice in its hands between two courses of action, the one of which may see it in that future age on a level with the greatest of these great States of the future, while the other will reduce it to the level of a purely European Power looking back, as Spain does now, to the great days when she pretended to be a great world-State? ”

Nothing could be more comprehensive of our true position, whether as regards the United Kingdom or the dominions, than this argument of Sir John Seeley. The United States is even to-day making herself felt, and is our greatest competitor in trade and wealth. The population of the United States, by immigration alone, is increasing at the rate of a million a year. It is appalling, then, to think of the development which that great country will have reached in another thirty years. As it is, to-day we are already greatly outnumbered. At present, in regard to naval resources and trade competition, our population can only be considered at 47,000,000, as compared with 61,000,000 in Germany, and about 90,000,000 in the United States. In Germany the population increases more than twice as fast as ours, and the population in the American Union more than three times as rapidly. On the other hand, we have practically reached the zenith of our development, so far as regards the United

Kingdom, though the development of the British Empire has scarcely begun. Is it, then, to be a commercial rivalry between the British Empire and the United States, or the United Kingdom and the United States? If the latter, the contest will become fearfully unequal, and the result a foregone conclusion. Let us, then, endeavour to reach the highest and noblest state of our national existence—the federation of the British race.

The preceding chapters have also tried to show that Imperial unity is not to be desired for the sentimental reason alone, but for the more selfish—though more practical—reason of the great community of interests that we have: the interests of trade and commerce and the advantage of mutual protection in war. Imperial Federation is founded upon both sentimental and practical reasons. But it is a question, great and noble as it is, in spite of its many logical facts to uphold it, most difficult to bring within the full comprehension of the masses of the people both at home and in the oversea States. It is at once so large, so broad, and seemingly so full of intricate problems.

It is a question also that has to contend with other difficulties. There is a class of people even to-day, both in the United Kingdom and in the Dominions, who openly advocate the dismemberment of the Empire. There is another class who, though for political reasons they do not dare openly to advocate such views, yet secretly cherish the idea and dream of the ultimate independence of Canada, Australia, and South Africa. Then there are many—probably at present they are in the majority—who do not look into the future, but dwell exclusively in the present, and consider that the present system of the British Empire works well, and who are thoroughly in favour of its maintenance, but who would at any time strenuously oppose any change whereby the Empire could become more consolidated politically: those who believe in *laissez-faire*, whose views about any federation whereby the exclusive control of financial affairs might of necessity be modified, would oppose any change. Although they would behold

the approach of ultimate separation with regret, yet on account of their narrow-minded views it would be a certainty, and, therefore, not to be helped. Then there are many of us in the United Kingdom who seem incapable of grasping Imperial affairs, whose range is limited to "thinking in islands" when we should "think in continents," or even in "empires."

Cecil Rhodes, in the same letter to Mr. Wm. T. Stead quoted in a previous chapter, in writing of his hopes for the consolidation of the British race, and ultimately the union of all the English-speaking peoples, thus wrote :—

"It is a fearful thought to feel that you possess a patent, and to doubt whether your life will last you through the circumlocution of the forms of the Patent Office. I have that inner conviction that, if I can live, I have thought out something that is worthy of being registered at the Patent Office; the fear is: shall I have the time and the opportunity? And I believe, with all the enthusiasm bred in the soul of an inventor, it is not self-glorification that I desire, but the wish to live to register my patent for the benefit of those who, I think, are the greatest people the world has ever seen, but whose fault is that they do not know their destiny, and who are wasting their time on their minor local matters; but, being asleep, do not know that through the invention of steam and electricity, and in view of their enormous increase, they must now be trained to view the world as a whole, and not only to consider the social questions of the British Isles. Even a Labouchere, who possesses no sentiment, should be taught that the labour of England is dependent on the outside world, and that, as far as I can see, the outside world, if it does not look out, will boycott the results of English labour."

These few sentences show the "insularity" of a great portion of our people, and this may be equally well applied to the "provincialism" of some of our kin in the Dominions. We are both still apt to concern ourselves too much with the particular piece of territory in which we are domiciled, ignoring those in other parts

of this vast Empire. Though local questions are important and cannot be neglected, they should be properly provided for in a legislature for that purpose. In other words, as heretofore, advocated even to-day, the business of the Imperial Parliament should be decentralised. This question then, in view of these considerations, must take a great length of time to gain a hold on the affections and minds of the people both at home and oversea. And it is to be feared that, owing to our party system of Government, it will be rendered even more difficult; for whatever party proposed it, the other party would probably oppose it. It may be regretted that such a question should not be above party politics, but should in every sense become a national concern. Even so, there are forces at work which may precipitate an inquiry of the whole question, and then it must stand or fall on its own merits.

It has been heretofore said that the States of the Empire at present have hardly arrived at a stage in their development when they can be considered ripe for it, but it is known that some communities are undoubtedly more able to consider it than others, and it would, therefore, be unnecessary to delay Federation until such time as one and all of the communities shall be prepared for it. For, as Mr. George R. Parkin wrote in his book, "Imperial Federation": "As well argue that a man must not admit his eldest son into partnership until the youngest has come of age, as claim that Canada, with its constitution already consolidated by a quarter of a century's history, must still wait another quarter or half a century for its rightful position in the nation to which it belongs because the West Indies and South Africa have not been able to work their way through certain stages of political evolution. Strange indeed would have been the political position of the United States had they waited to frame their federal system till Colorado was on a level with Massachusetts."

The logic of this argument seems irrefragable and peculiarly in point, although Mr. Parkin has overlooked

the historical fact that at the time of the formation of the American Union, Colorado was part of the Spanish Empire.

The Federation of the Empire might, therefore, take place gradually, embracing, to begin with, probably only one or two countries, and gradually expanding by admitting the other communities, who might consider it after having seen the advantages it brought to others. The present British Constitution is the result of growth, so that the Federation of the Empire, if not entered into by all the communities together, might also become like the British Constitution, a result of growth.

It is a matter, then, that all patriotic parents and heads of schools should endeavour to teach the youth of the Empire, to get the idea firmly fixed in their minds with regard to those countries in process of formation. It should be taken up in the national schools of the Empire, which teach the masses, and by the great English public schools, which contain many of England's future statesmen. It is a question which over and over again should be argued by the debating societies of the universities of the Empire and of working-men's clubs. Above all, it is incumbent upon those in authority to do nothing that will tend to dissipate this idea.

The centrifugal tendencies are seen by proposals of treaty-making powers for the Dominions, proposals that have been popular in some quarters for years, but which have been given renewed vigour by the dissatisfaction of many at home and in Canada over the Alaskan Boundary award. These centrifugal tendencies are plainly visible when certain people in Canada hold or cherish the notion that "Canada is a nation," and speak of the Canadian nation. True, Canada is a nation, or rather part of a nation; for Canada is but an extension of the English State, having the British Constitution in principle for her people. The people of Canada therefore form and are a part of the British nation, which is not only found in the United Kingdom, but in different parts of the British Empire. It is absurd, then, to

speaking of Canada as being a nation, depending as she does upon the Parliament of her Motherland.

Again, these tendencies are seen by the friction which sometimes exists between officers in the Imperial and Colonial Service. Mr. George R. Parkin most aptly said "that a danger to the Empire was the supercilious Englishman and the bumptious Colonial." All these differences are caused by a want of tact and diplomacy on both sides. It is then Disintegration or Federation which faces us in this twentieth century. Soon we may come to the "parting of the ways."

"Are we to be an Empire?" said Mr. Chamberlain, "or are we to be only a kingdom? The great Napoleon said that 'Providence was always on the side of the big battalions.' Do you suppose that is not the same with countries as with armies? The struggle for life, the struggle for existence in future will not be between cities or even kingdoms; it will be between mighty empires; and the minor States will come off badly if they are left to be crushed between the gigantic bulk of these higher organisations." Again, he adds: "Are not we also an Empire? Are we not as great in area and as great in population, greater in the variety of our products and opportunities than any empire that exists or that the world has ever seen? Yes; but our union is incomplete, and the question which to me is everything is, 'Will it attain to a higher organisation?' It is impossible that it can remain the same; it must either shrink or it must develop. Our greatest thinkers and writers put this problem clearly before us—Seeley, Froude, Lecky. They also dreamed dreams and saw visions of a united Empire finding its salvation in new forces of attraction capable of counteracting the centrifugal tendencies of its present composition. . . . We have been gradually becoming more conscious of our duty and of our Imperial responsibility. But it remains to the statesman of the twentieth century, to those now living and to those yet to come, to complete this great work, the greatest that has ever fallen to a governing race to perform. . . . In the great revolution which

separated the United States from Great Britain, the greatest man that that revolution produced, according to my judgment, was Alexander Hamilton. He was soldier and statesman, and he left a precious legacy to his countrymen when he disclosed to them the secrets of union, and when he said to them, 'Learn to think continentally.' And, my fellow-citizens, if I may give you a message now, I would say to you, 'Learn to think Imperially.'"

Let us, then, try to follow Mr. Chamberlain's earnest admonition to "learn to think Imperially." Let us consider the cities of Toronto, Cape Town, and Melbourne as we consider London, Dublin, and Glasgow—the manufacturers of Toronto as much our own, as those of Sheffield—the Torontonians as the Londoners. In other words, let us become conscious of our Imperial nationality—of an Imperial patriotism. Let us, if possible, become primarily, not English, Irish, Scottish, Australians, Canadians, or South Africans—but Britons. Let us try to emulate, at least in one respect, the Roman Empire; for there the Syrian, the Pannonian, the Briton and the Spaniard, was first and last a Roman.

There may be sacrifices to be made. It may be hard to consider favourably such a great reconstruction of the British Empire such as Federation will entail. Probably this will fall hardest upon the United Kingdom, which will have to give up its sole control of foreign policy and other Imperial matters. But for the attainment of our ideal this should not be difficult.

It is perhaps mere academic speculation to view "what might have been," but the fact remains that the policy of the Little Englanders (men who looked forward to the dismemberment of the Empire, a sentiment which was dominant for many years) has had an influence on this Empire, which influence has made the consummation of the idea of an Imperial union more difficult. It is true that had the "old Colonial system" been maintained, the Empire could not have long survived. It is equally true, in a sense, that our new "Colonial

system " has done much to delay the day when dismemberment will come. But that it will forever hold the Empire together is not to be thought of. With the adoption of the new Colonial system we went from one extreme to another. Under the old system the legislative autonomy of the Colonies was restricted, often crippled; but in spite of these disadvantages there were also some advantages, whereby the trade of the Mother Country and the Colonies was stimulated by a policy of preferential treatment. Much has been said and written derogatory of the navigation laws, but that there were compensations for the restrictions imposed is undoubted. The repeal of all these Acts, on the introduction of Free Trade in England, caused great dissatisfaction and loss in the Colonies. The granting of such unlimited powers of self-government to the Colonies was achieved by governments at home who considered that the day for separation was near, and that the sooner it came the better; thus they prepared those "rising nations" for that independence which seemed so near at hand, in order that when it came they would have the benefits of free government.

No enlightened individual will now contend that the granting of self-government to the great Colonies was a mistake. For the charter of self-government was undoubtedly the means of preventing separation, and as such is always to be regarded in a class with Magna Charta. But there is a limit to all things. That the Home Government should have granted the Colonies exclusive control over the tariff, whereby they were enabled to lay duties against the products of British labour at home equally with foreign products, does not seem to have been either equitable or good policy. In fact the Colonial tariffs were devised in such a way that their chief effect was aimed against British products. Now when one takes into consideration that the people at home were enduring the burden of a great national debt, largely increased in the foundation and defence of these very same Colonies, and also supported the Army and Navy for the defence of all, it

would certainly seem that the people who with their blood and treasure founded these countries should have, if not an open market, at least a preferential one, for the access of the fruits of their labours. The wealth of the Colonies was not in their manufactures, but essentially in agriculture. The imposition of a high tariff forced premature manufacture and created populous cities, to the detriment of agriculture. It should have been the primary aim of those in authority to have fostered the agricultural products of the Colonies and to have started the growth of cotton, thereby looking forward to the day when the British Empire would become a self-sustaining community. Had, therefore, the Home Government denied, or at least sought to restrict, the right of taxation against British goods to mere revenue duties, or at the most to moderate protective duties, the fiscal union of the Empire would either exist as a fact to-day or would be much easier to encompass. In other words, instead of doing away entirely with the Navigation Acts, if they had developed and improved the advantages, the Empire to-day would be self-sustaining, and, therefore, materially much richer and more powerful. Furthermore, commercial union would have paved the way and eventually have led to closer political union.

Lord Beaconsfield, who has been called the prophet of the "Imperial idea," in discussing this question of Colonial autonomy, said: "But self-government, in my opinion, when it was conceded, ought to have been conceded as part of a great policy of Imperial consolidation. It ought to have been accompanied with an Imperial tariff, by securities for the people of England of the enjoyment of the unappropriated lands which belonged to the sovereign as their trustee, and by a military code which should have precisely defined the means and the responsibility by which the Colonies should be defended, and by which, if necessary, this country should call for aid from the Colonies themselves. It ought further to have been accompanied by some representative council in the Metropolis which

would have brought the Colonies into constant and continuous relations with the Home Government."

The wholesale transfer of unoccupied lands to the Colonial Governments, which should properly have been the inheritance of the nation collectively, seems to have been a very radical and shortsighted policy. That a great part of them should have been handed over to the local authorities is not denied, but that whole continents as large as the United States, containing millions of acres of valuable land rich in all mineral resources, should without reservation have been handed over to what was then a handful of Colonists was certainly neither equity nor wisdom. The reservation by the Imperial Government of only a portion would have produced a great source of wealth to it. The revenue therefrom could have gone towards defraying that part of the national debt which the acquisition of these same lands entailed. The Federal Government of the United States holds large sections of territory, known as Government reservations, and the wisdom and right of so doing is manifest to all.

Perhaps, however, the most foolish and shortsighted idea of all of the "Separatists" was that of forcing upon our people in Australia and Canada a difference in the grand old flag.

Froude, in his "Oceana," writing on this subject, said: "The Australians do not like a bar sinister over their scutcheon, as if they were bastards and not legitimate; and surely of all ill-considered measures in our dealings with the Colonies the indignity of forcing upon them a difference in the flag was the very worst. No affront was, of course, intended. The alteration originated, I believe, in some officialism unintelligible to the ordinary mind, and was taken up and insisted on as a part of the Separatist policy. By our poor kindred it has been taken as an intimation, flaunted perpetually in their faces, that we look on them as our inferiors and not as our equals. Those who are talking and writing so eagerly about a confederated Empire should insist at once and without delay that when any Colony expresses

a desire to fly over its ships and ports the old flag of England, neither childish pedantry nor treacherous secret designs to break the Empire into fragments shall be allowed to interfere with a patriotic and honourable purpose."

It is certainly derogatory to the Imperial idea to hear of the Canadian flag, slight as the difference may be. The British people should most emphatically only be represented by one flag, and, according to the poet, have "One life, one flag, one fleet, one throne."

However, we have all advanced since then, and the Imperial idea is, in spite of all these set-backs, steadily gaining every year a strong hold upon the people throughout the Empire. Much can now be done to forward the idea by securing many of the proposals discussed, of "Practical Imperialism," as well as by free and frequent discussion in the Press and in literature generally, and further by the Imperial Conferences, which are to be a regular occurrence every four years.

There is one thing more to advocate, and that most important in its way. The Sovereign will probably be unable to visit the more remote parts of the Empire owing to pressure of State business. But there is no reason why a great portion of his subjects should scarcely ever be brought into active contact with his Majesty or the Royal Family. The influence of the Crown is already a great factor in cementing the Empire. Why not make even greater use of it? Could not a splendid custom be adopted—for the Heir-Apparent when at a suitable age to be made Viceroy of India? It would be a great compliment to our Indian fellow-subjects—touch their hearts and appeal very strongly to their imagination. They would then become familiar with their future Emperor. There is no reason why the Heir-Apparent or some member of the Royal Family could not reside in India a part of the time for a few years. During his temporary absence some one else could occupy that office. Likewise, some of the Royal Dukes and Princes should be

made Viceroys of Canada, Australia, and South Africa. This would bring our fellow-subjects in those Dominions in closer contact with the Throne and Royal Family. This is to be greatly desired for sentimental, political, and social reasons.

The general view now held by statesmen at home is that any scheme or suggestions in favour of closer unity must now come from the Dominions themselves. For Canada three roads are open. One is annexation to the United States, such as the great majority of our fellow-subjects are against, for upon annexation Canada would have to give up many of her institutions, and accept a form of government which she fought against, and which, in the opinion of many great minds, is less superior to her own. In fact it has been openly acknowledged by some American publicists and statesmen that the American system and form of government is excelled by that existing in the Dominion of Canada. And, with all due respect to the United States, it must be admitted by impartial observers that in the liberty and freedom of the subject and in political morality the United States must without doubt give place to the British Empire.

Independence, secondly, would depose Canada from her position as a part of the first nation of the world, and for many years she would rank as a Third-rate Power, existing on the sufferance of the nation to the South, having to maintain a navy and army on a scale not much better than a South American Republic. Let us, therefore, realise the postulate that the whole is greater than its part.

The last and noblest destiny of Canada is to form an important unit in a British Federal Union, having the great markets of the Empire open to her commerce. An able Canadian journalist, writing a few years ago on this question to the *Halifax Evening Mail*, said: "It means a pooling of the offensive and defensive resources of the Empire, the gaining of strength by cohesion, the binding of the bundle of sticks by firm cords, the hooping of staves of the barrel, of which operations Judge Haliburton and Joseph Howe long ago clearly

foresaw the need. It involves the representation of the self-governing Colonies in some Imperial legislative body, and their participation in the Imperial government and Imperial expenses. It means paying our shot and shouldering our reciprocal responsibility like Britons. The consummation of this scheme will make us part owners in every Imperial establishment in every part of the world, peers with our fellow-Britons, instead of Colonists or dependents. It is like going into partnership with one's mother, instead of staying tied to her apron-strings. Our recent troubles with the United States certainly argue that we cannot prudently wait as we are until we are rich enough and populous enough for independence. Federation would force the thoughts of our public men to expand. It would oblige our voters to consider their Imperial as well as their provincial interests. It would breed statesmen, instead of parochial politicians. It would not be as costly as independence, and certainly not more costly than union with the United States."

As for Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa, their one alternative is to be independent States of doubtful independence, on a scale similar to Canada, constantly menaced by the Powers of Europe and Asia; for the isolation of Australasia has been shown to be a thing of the past. The rise of Japan and the expansion of Russia, and in fact the whole evolution of affairs in the East have done away with this. Again, British South Africa is faced by France in Madagascar and Germany and Portugal in the Cameroons and Delagoa Bay. The true destiny and the safest is therefore for Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa to remain in the Empire and become partners in the Britannic Federal Union. In other words, they would raise themselves from the position of mere dependencies, from their Colonial status, with its attendant inferiority, to the level and magnitude of States on a par with their Motherland, and thus by having reached their legal majority share in the great Imperial partnership.

"All suggestions for closer unity must come from the

Dominions themselves ” is the general opinion of our statesmen at home. The day must come then when these great British communities must realise the inferiority and disadvantage of their Colonial status, and will demand to become partners with their Motherland in a British Federation, sharing, as Sir Henry Parkes said, “in all the glory of the Empire.” May that day be near ! But whether or not we or only our children shall live to see it, it is to be hoped that the people in the Motherland—in England, Ireland and Scotland—will rise to the occasion and grant those requests which, for the future of the British Empire, we trust will eventually be made. Thus we shall have a British Empire that will share with the other great Anglo-Saxon community, the United States, the magnificent task of guiding the destiny and peace of the world, thus assuring eventually that perfect state of political existence idealised by our great poet : “ The Parliament of Man, and the Federation of the World.”

INDEX.

- AMERICAN goods dumped in Britain, 187
- American system of self-government in dependencies, 6
- Arbitration, universal, suggested, 166
- Argentine Republic, immigration to, 195
- Army, advantages of an Imperial, 143, 145
 - exchange of battalions between Colonies, 148
 - exchange of officers between Australia and India, 149
 - Intelligence Department, 152
 - pay of officers, 147
 - power of Parliament over the, 92
 - scheme for an Imperial, 151
 - short-service system, 146
 - standard of recruits, 198
 - supply of recruits, 146
- Asiatics, exclusive acts against, 64, 113 f.
- Attorney-General for the Empire, 69
- Australia and preference, 177
 - attitude towards Imperial defence, 7
 - compulsory military training in, 142
 - gift to Imperial Navy, 105
 - Japanese Consuls in, 113
 - self-government in, 39
 - Senators of, 53
 - unit for the Pacific Fleet, 111
- Australian Commonwealth Bill, 23
- Austrian Navy, the, 127
- Austro - Hungarian Empire, Council of Delegations of the, 29
- BACON, Lord, 38
- Balfour, A. J., 138
- Beaconsfield, Lord, 229
- Beaumont, Admiral Sir Lewis, 111
- Bellairs, Carlyon, "The Empire and the Century," 127
- Bismarck, Count, 120, 121
- Blaine, James G., 197
- Booth, Charles, 198
- Brassey, Lord, 132, 205
- Brassey, T. A., 66, 72
- Bright, John, 8
- Britain and Ireland, Union of, 39
- Britannic Empire, Constitution of the United States of the, 84
- British areas out of cultivation, 178
 - Constitution, executive head of, 64
 - Cotton Growing Association, 214
 - Dominions, exports to, 180
 - Empire, different nationalities in, 218 f.
 - — expansion of, 1
 - — League, 15
 - — population in 1837 and 1912, 2
 - — suggested title for ruler of, 35
 - — supreme executive power, 93
 - — written constitution for the, 82-98
- British Isles, exports and imports, 179 f.
 - — invasion of, 139
 - merchant marine, 206
- British-Japanese Alliance, 112

Bryce, James, "The American Commonwealth," 56

Burke, Edmund, 16, 40 f., 45, 82 f.

Bülow, Prince von, 21, 119

CABLE messages, time taken in sending, 58

— rates, Imperial, 203, 207

Cables, all-British system cf, 207

Campbell-Bannerman, Sir Henry, 72

Canada, American immigration to, 197

— attitude towards Imperial defence, 7

— and British Foreign Policy, 24

— constitution of Senate of, 53

— contributions to Imperial expenditure, 107

— dependent on British Navy, 108

— and the Far East, 63

— the future of, 232

— the grain areas of, 175

— and Imperial Defence, 132

— and Imperial federation, 11

— as an integral part of Britain, 225

— merchant marine of, 108

— postal facilities with United States, 208

— and preference, 177

— reciprocity treaty with United States, 184 f.

— surtax on German goods, 173, 184

— self-government in, 39

— Canada, steamship service to, 204

Canadian mails, 204

— Militia, the, 150

— Naval Programme, 110

Carnegie, Andrew, 166

Chamberlain, Joseph, 4 f., 21, 58, 105, 178, 226

Civil List, the, 164 f., 160

— Service, Imperial, 215

Clarke, Sir George Sydenham, 205

Cobden, Richard, 170

Coke, Sir Edward, 36, 45, 68

Coinage, Imperial, 217

Colonies, self-government in the, 5, 228

Commercial bureau, Imperial, 203

Confederation of the Empire, Draft Bill for a, 78-82

Conscription, 142

Constantine the Great, 33

Constitution, Amendments to the, 98

Consular service, the, 215 ff.

Continent, balance of power on the, 140

Copyright and patents, 217

Corn Laws, the, 175

Cotton supply, our, 214

Council, Imperial, 25, 29, 80, 203

— — functions of, 51

Creasy, Sir Edward, 37

Crimes, trials for, 95

Crown Colonies, status of the, 48

— revenues surrendered, 165

Customs Union, Imperial, 155, 162

DEAKIN, ALFRED, 74

Debt, consolidation of Imperial, 156 f.

— incurred on account of Colonies, 158

Defence, Imperial, 99, 133, 135, 138 f., 144, 203

Delphic Amphictyonic Council, 14

Deterioration of the masses, physical, 198 f.

De Tocqueville, Comte, 99

Dilke, Sir Charles, 102

Dingley tariff, the, 182, 184

Diplomatic service, the, 215 ff.
 Dunraven, Lord, "Ireland's
 Financial Burden," 196
 Durham, Lord, 5

EDUCATION, Imperial, 209
 Emigration Commissioners ap-
 pointed, 191 f.
 — Committee on (1826), 191
 — formation of Colonisation
 Board, 194
 — State aid to, 189 ff., 203
 Emperor or King, choice of
 title, 32
 England and Scotland, Union
 of, 38
 Expenditure, Imperial, 164, 166

FEDERAL government, system of,
 13, 14
 — Parliament, 12, 25, 62, 188
 Federation, Imperial, 10 f., 22
 — parties to Imperial, 24
 Finance, Imperial, 154 ff.
 Fiscal policy of the Empire, 167
 Flag, an Imperial, 231
 Fleming, Sir Sanford, 207
 Foreign policy of the future, 9
 Forrest, Sir John, 111
 Forster, W. E., 57
 France, colonies of, 220
 — defence of, 138, 139
 Franchise, Imperial, 49
 Franklin, Benjamin, 16, 22, 40
 Freeman, E. A., 60f.
 Free Trade, 171 ff., 186
 — — effect on Ireland, 179
 — — within the British Em-
 pire, 169, 188
 French, Sir John, 138, 150
 Froude, James Anthony, 43, 230

GEOGRAPHY, British text-books
 on, 210
 — teaching of, in schools, 209

German colonial possessions,
 119
 — naval policy, 118, 123
 Germany and colonisation, 21,
 220
 — exports from, 181
 — goods dumped in Britain, 187
 — progress of, 221
 Giffen, Sir Robert, 178
 Gilbert, Sir Humphrey, 193
 Gladstone, W. E., 71
 — Irish Bill of 1886, 17
 — on American federal govern-
 ment, 19
 Goltz, Von der, 121
 "Grand Tour" of the Empire
 suggested, 211
 Greswell, Mr., at London
 Chamber of Commerce
 (1888), 26
 Grey, Francis W., 11

HALDANE, Viscount, 136, 151
 Haliburton, Judge, 232
 Hamilton, Alexander, 128, 129,
 159 ff., 227
 Hatherley, Lord, 73
 Hodgins, Frank E., 109
 Holland and Java, 220
 "Home Rule all round," 71
 House of Commons, 46, 86
 — — — representation in, 47
 — — Lords, origin and consti-
 tution of, 52
 — — Representatives of the
 United States, 47
 Howe, Joseph, 232
 Hume, Joseph, 41
 Hutton, J. A., 214

IMPERIAL Army, an, 143
 — Assembly, four proposed
 schemes of an, 26
 — — Cabinet, 27, 28
 — Civil List, 160
 — — Service, 215

Imperial-Colonial Mail Service,
205

Imperial Conference (1902),
168f.

— Council, 25, 29, 80, 203

— Defence, 99, 133, 135, 138

— — the Dominions and, 144

— — the problem of, 138, 139

— education, 209

— Federal Parliament, 43

— federation, 10f.

— Federation League, 15

— — meaning of, 22

— history, teaching of, 211

— Navy, the necessity for an,
125

— Parliament, 40, 42, 46, 55,
56

— — questions for the, 28

— trade preference, 28

— travel and education, 213

— unity, sentiment in favour
of, 3

Imperialism, practical, 202

India and the Imperial Navy,
115

— Heir-Apparent as Viceroy of,
231

— the status of, 48

JAPAN and Australia, 64, 65

Japan-Chinese War, 112

Judiciary system, the, 95

KAPPEY, Ferdinand E., 58, 59

Kitchener, Lord, 138, 150

LABOUR Exchanges, 195

Laurier, Sir Wilfrid, 109, 197

Law, Bonar, 170

Law of the land, supreme, 98

Laws, Imperial code of, 203

London County Council, census
of outcasts, 199

— paupers in, 199

London, Jack, "The People of
the Abyss," 199

MACDONALD, Sir John, 13

Mail service to Canada and
Australia, 205

Manhood suffrage, 49

Maurice, Sir Frederick, 198

Methuen, Lord, 150

Metric system, the, 217

Military forces, the, 133-137

Mill, John Stuart, 194

Morley, Lord, 17, 63

NATIONAL Colonisation Society,
192

— Debt, 97

— — apportionment of the, 159

— Service League, 141

Naval bases, importance of
British, 102

— defence, the Dominions and,
104

Navigation Acts, the, 229

Navy, cost of Imperial, 105 f.

— League, the German, 122

New Zealand, contribution to
Imperial Navy, 111

— — and preference, 177

— — self-government of, 39

North Sea as theatre of war,
131

"OUR German Cousins," 122

PARKES, Sir Henry, 66, 234

Parkin, George R., "Imperial
Federation," 224 ff.

Parliament of the British
Empire, 36, 86

— annual session of, 59

— apportionment of members
of, 87

— the casting vote, 88

— electing members of, 86

— expulsion of member, 90

— functions of, 55, 56

— travelling expenses of
members, 50

— Federal, 12, 25

- Parliament, Federal, difficulties in the way of a, 44
- — functions of, 62
- — tariff framed by, 188
- James I. establishes an Irish, 38
- limitations of the power of, 92
- meaning of the term, 37
- meeting of, 89
- mode of dissolving, 89
- — — summoning, 89
- Orders, Votes, and Resolutions, 90
- parties eligible to be members of, 86
- payment of members, 49, 50, 55
- powers of each House, 89 ff.
- privileges of members, 90
- qualifications of members, 86
- the Speaker and impeachment, 88
- vacancies, 87
- Patents and copyright, 217
- Pauperism and emigration, 201
- in the United Kingdom, 201
- Peerage of the British Empire, 216
- Pellatt, Colonel Sir Henry M., 148
- Penn, William, 16
- Postal Convention of 1875, 208
- Press agency, Imperial, 207
- Privy Council and Cabinet, the Imperial, 67, 94
- — functions and duties of, 68
- — Judicial Committee of, 203
- — Ministers of the, 69
- QUADRENNIAL Imperial Conference, 27
- REFORM Bill of 1831-32, 41
- Republic or limited monarchy, 31
- Revenue Bills, 90
- Rhodes, Cecil, 4, 17, 20, 182, 223
- Scholarships at Oxford, 212
- Rights and liberties, preservation of, 96
- Roberts, Lord, 141
- Roman, Holy Roman, and British Empires contrasted, 34
- Rome on Britain, influence of, 33
- Rosebery, Lord, 8, 9, 10, 24, 187
- Rosyth naval base, 123
- Royal Naval Reserves, 115
- Russia, progress of, 221
- Russo-Japanese War, 101, 129
- SALVATION Army and emigration, 200
- Sea, Command of the, 99, 100
- Sea-power of Foreign Nations, 118
- Seddon, Richard John, 148, 208
- Seeley, Professor J. R., "The Expansion of England," 67, 189, 220
- Selborne, Lord, 116, 130
- Senate of the British Empire, 51, 88
- constitution of the, 53
- officials of the, 89
- power to try impeachments, 89
- the President of the, 88
- representation in, 54
- vacancies in the, 89
- Senators, qualifications for, 88
- Slums, overcrowding in the, 198
- Smith, Adam, "Wealth of Nations," 16, 154, 157, 167, 206
- Smith, Goldwin, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64

South Africa, Colonial troops sent to, 18
 — — and the Imperial Navy, 114
 — African Colonies federated, 39
 — — War, 137
 Sovereign, maintenance of the, 94
 — powers of the, 94
 — and his title, the, 30
 State debts, 97
 States, admission of new, 97
 — limitation of the powers of the, 93
 Steamships, subsidies to, 203 f.
 Stopford, W. E., 212
 Subsidies to Colonial producers, 185
 Supreme Court, an Imperial, 73-77

TARIFF, preferential, between British Dominions, 168, 170
 — — and United States, 183
 — Reform, 177
 — — Commission, 171 f., 174
 Tax, the Income. 162 f.
 Taxation, Imperial, 154 ff.
 Territorial Army, the, 136, 150
 Todd, A., "Parliamentary Government in the Colonies," 77
 Trade of the Empire, 100
 — inter-Imperial, 61, 181
 — preference, Imperial, 28
 Treason, 96
 Treitschke, Heinrich von, 121
 Turgot, A. R. J., 17

UNEMPLOYED problem, the, 190
 Union of England and Scotland, 34
 United Kingdom under Federation, status of, 70-72
 — — trade of, 106
 United States, constitution of the, 54, 57
 — — emigration to, 195, 200
 — — exports from, 181
 — — federal government in, 18, 19
 — — government reservations in, 230
 — — naval policy of, 124
 — — progress of, 221
 — — senators of the, 53
 — — the Supreme Court in, 76
 — — trade relations between Britain and the, 184
 — — wheat export from, 176
 Upper Chamber of Imperial Parliament, choice of name, 55

VOGEL, Sir Julius, 185, 187

WAKEFIELD, Edward Gibbon, 192

Washington, George, 23

Wealth and resources of British Empire, 2

Weights and measures, metric system of, 217

YOUNG, Sir Frederick, 14

ZOLLVEREIN for the British Empire, 185 f., 188

